DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 143 727 UD 017 285

AUTHOR	King, Nicki J.; And Others
TITLE	Title IV of the Civil Rights Act of 1964: Expansion of Program Responsibilities.
INSTITUTION	Rand Corp., Santa Monica, Calif.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
REPORT NO	R-2136-HEW
PUB DATE	May 77
CONTRACT	OEC-0-749262
NOTE	116p.; For related documents see ED 133 413 and ED 133 412 ; Best copy available
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 HC-$6.01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Agency Role; *Interagency Cooperation; *Interagency Coordination; *Program Descriptions; Program Effectiveness; Program Evaluation; Questionnaires; Racial Discrimination; Racial Integration; *Sex Discrimination; *State Agencies
IDENTIFIERS	*Civil Rights Act 1964 Title IV; General Assistance Centers; State Education Agencies

ABSTRACT

Beginning with program year 1975-76, Title IV was implemented to help school districts end sex discrimination. This report describes how this additional responsibility has affected Title IV projects. The analysis focuses equally on two components: 1) identifying how outcome variables seemed important in the project's delivery of race and sex desegregation services and 2) describing the differences in Title IV program operations and project office characteristics compared with available data from the previous year's study. Preliminary views of recent literature on the problems attending race and sex discrimination indicate that the two issues are not identical. Agencies committed to delivering services in both areas might experience considerable strain or confusion if the dissimilarity between the two types of discrimination is not recognized. This research attempts to identify possible areas of such strain as a necessary step in determining the compatibility of the two types of discrimination within the Title IV program of assistance and training. The study uses mail questionnaires as the primary means of analysis. These were sent to project directors and to selected staff members of the General Assistance Centers, State Education Agencies, Training Institutes, and the new Type S Training Institutes. Among the findings of the study is that of the three Title IV project types that involved both race and sex desegregation assistance, the State Educational Agencies undertook sex desegregation assistance more than did the General Assistance Centers and Type D Institutes. (Author/AM)

Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original.

ED143727

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TITLE IV OF THE CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1964: EXPANSION OF PROGRAM RESPONSIBILITIES

PREPARED FOR THE U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION, DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

NICKI J. KING, MARGARET A. THOMAS, MORLIE H. GRAUBARD,
WITH THE ASSISTANCE OF LONNA P. OLIVER

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

R-2136-HEW
MAY 1977

UD017285

Rand
SANTA MONICA, CA 90406

PREFACE

Title IV of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 authorizes the U.S. Office of Education (USOE) to provide technical assistance and training services to school districts for the purpose of meeting special needs associated with implementing school desegregation or eliminating sex discrimination. Assistance and training are to be provided by one or more of the following:

- General Assistance Centers located at colleges, universities, or other agencies.
- State Education Agencies located in the State Departments of Education.
- Training Institutes located at colleges or universities.
- Direct grants to the school districts themselves.

Earlier Rand reports (Stephen Crocker et al., *Title IV of the Civil Rights Act of 1964: Executive Summary* and *A Review of Program Operations*, R-1901/1-HEW and R-1901/2-HEW) describe these project types and their relationship to USOE in detail. The present report is a more narrowly focused analysis of the changes in Title IV project operations that have occurred as a result of adding responsibility for helping eliminate sex discrimination to the Title IV charter.

This research was conducted at the request of the Office of Planning, Budgeting and Evaluation (OPBE) of the U.S. Office of Education. Two issues are addressed by this report. The first is determining the degree to which assistance in remedying sex discrimination is compatible with the ongoing Title IV mission of delivering school desegregation assistance. The second issue is analyzing the response of Title IV project offices to a shift in their responsibilities. The intended audience of the report is Title IV program personnel at the four types of Title IV projects as well as at the regional and national levels of the U.S. Office of Education.

SUMMARY

For several years, Title IV of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 has provided technical assistance and training services to school districts needing help in racial desegregation. Beginning with program year 1975-1976, a new responsibility was added to the Title IV mandate—helping districts end sex discrimination. This report describes how this additional responsibility has affected Title IV projects. Specifically, we address two questions:

1. How compatible is the new responsibility with the ongoing Title IV mission?
2. How have Title IV project offices responded to the additional responsibility, and what form has that response taken?

Preliminary review of recent literature on the problems attending race and sex discrimination indicates that the two issues are not identical. Agencies committed to delivering services in both areas might experience considerable strain or confusion if the dissimilarity between the two types of discrimination is not recognized. Therefore, we decided that our research should attempt to identify possible areas of such strain or confusion as a necessary step in determining the compatibility of the two types of discrimination within the Title IV program of assistance and training.

METHODOLOGY

In design and methodology, this report is somewhat similar to our earlier evaluation of Title IV.[1] However, the present study is more narrowly focused than the earlier evaluation, and as a result, more emphasis has been placed on data gathered by mail questionnaires and less on site-visit information. The mail questionnaires were sent to project directors and to selected staff members of the General Assistance Centers (GACs), State Education Agencies (SEAs), and Training Institutes (both Type D Institutes, which focus primarily on race desegregation assistance and the new Type S TIs, which were established specifically to deliver sex desegregation assistance). The mail questionnaires directed to staff requested information on project activities within the specific client districts served by the projects. The project director mail questionnaires requested more general information on project organization and operations. Site visits were made to a limited number of GACs and SEAs (12 of each type) and 24 of their client districts. This information helped us develop a descriptive framework for clarifying the analysis of the mail questionnaires.

The use of mail questionnaires as the primary means of analysis also led to the specification of outcome variables for all three project types. These outcome vari-

[1] Stephen Crocker et al., *Title IV of the Civil Rights Act of 1964: A Review of Program Operations. Executive Summary*, The Rand Corporation, R-1901/1-HEW, August 1976; and Stephen Crocker et al., *Title IV of the Civil Rights Act of 1964: A Review of Program Operations*, The Rand Corporation, R-1901/2-HEW, August 1976.

ables can be grouped in three general categories: (1) implementation problems, (2) effectiveness, and (3) strain. Implementation problems are those a Title IV project might encounter in delivering assistance or training services to its client districts. Indicators of effectiveness were identified in those areas in which a project might have the most impact on a given client district. Problems that a project encountered in staffing, planning its program, or interacting with other agencies were regarded as strain. The analysis focused equally on two components: (1) identifying how these outcome variables seemed important in the project's delivery of race and sex desegregation services, and (2) describing the differences in Title IV program operations and project office characteristics compared with available data from the previous year's study.

FINDINGS

Of the three Title IV project types that undertake both race and sex desegregation assistance, the SEAs undertake sex desegregation assistance more than do GACs and Type D Institutes. It appears that this assistance is well-defined in scope and primarily limited to technical assistance in establishing school district mechanisms to respond to the Title IX mandate. State Education Agencies that had difficulty delivering race desegregation assistance because of low concentrations of minorities and/or unwillingness of the districts to confront desegregation issues have a built-in audience for their Title IX services, and these services may provide them with an entrée into the district for race desegregation work. State Education Agencies involved more actively in race desegregation work appear to have no difficulty adding sex desegregation activities to their ongoing programs. Additionally, SEAs most often work with the school districts' administrative level in delivering their race desegregation services, and it is administrators who have been charged with the responsibility for instituting the first stage of changes to comply with sex desegregation orders. Further, SEAs experience fewer problems than GACs in delivering sex desegregation assistance but more problems in delivering race desegregation assistance. Apparently, sex desegregation is a very compatible area of assistance for SEAs, but less so for GACs.

It is not surprising, then, that GACs are not undertaking sex desegregation activities to as great an extent as the SEAs. This is probably because the sex desegregation services required by the Title IX mandate do not fit as well with their desegregation programs, which more often stress training and program-oriented services than do the SEA programs. Additionally, the GACs provide technical assistance less frequently than the SEAs, and this type of service is most appropriate for Title IX. General Assistance Centers also have less staff turnover than the other project types and might therefore have had less flexibility in hiring personnel qualified to assist in sex desegregation.

Type D Institutes are apt to have an established program through which they provide race desegregation training to their client districts. As a result, they may not have the flexibility to alter their programs to include sex desegregation assistance. Not surprisingly, Type D TIs undertook this assistance less frequently than the other project types. Also not surprisingly, when they did undertake such assistance, they worked it into their race desegregation program by "piggybacking."

This led to a configuration of sex desegregation activities for the Type D TIs that is different from other project types: They tended to undertake more of the instructional or long-term sex desegregation activities, the type of activities that predominate in their race desegregation services. Therefore, Type D TIs are less likely than the other project types to assist districts in complying with Title IX. This is logical, considering that Title IX requirements stress the administrative aspects, and considering that Institutes acting as providers of in-service training are more likely to have teachers than administrators as their primary district representatives.

Type S Institutes, as expected, undertake sex desegregation activities to a greater extent than the other project types. They are more likely to undertake assistance related to Title IX compliance than to offer instructional or long-range services. This appears to create difficulties for them, since they report more problems and strain in implementing their programs than other project types (even after controlling for the fact that they are new projects). We posit that this strain may be experienced for two reasons: First, the fact that they are offering more Title IX related services may indicate that they are working with both the instructional and administrative levels rather than concentrating on the level most appropriate (and traditional) for a *training* institute—teachers. Second, the fact that all the Type S TI directors and much of the staff are female may create difficulties for them as they attempt to render assistance to primarily all-male district administrators.

RECOMMENDATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

In making these recommendations, we considered the Title IV program as a whole and the collective needs of the school districts within a state or region. Accordingly, we recommend that SEAs be encouraged to continue providing technical assistance oriented services to any district within the state needing assistance with either race or sex desegregation. We recommend that GACs be encouraged to undertake both training activities and the development of district programs as part of their race desegregation services, and that they be encouraged to develop sex desegregation services that focus on long-range and instructional aspects. We recommend that the regional offices, when funding Title IV projects, look at the total spectrum of civil rights related needs of the districts in the region to try to insure that both race desegregation and sex desegregation assistance is available to districts as needed. Finally, at the federal level, the U.S. Office of Education should assure that Title IV assistance in remedying sex discrimination does not end when Title IX compliance is formally completed. Longer-range problems in sex discrimination may be both instructional and administrative in nature, and may not be addressed specifically by Title IX.

On balance, the addition of sex desegregation services has not changed the basic operational style of the three types of Title IV projects examined here. This indicates that even with the provision of these two types of assistance, there is still a distinct mix of activities that each project type does well. It would be inappropriate for Title IV to try to homogenize these project types. Rather, the program should seek to maximize the strengths of each organization in providing integrated services to school districts.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors wish to acknowledge the assistance of several people in this research. In particular, we wish to thank Stephen Crocker, who conceived of much of the research design and acted as principal investigator during the early phases of the research effort. We were aided in our analysis by Professor Peter Sperlich and Roger Rasmussen, and we owe them our thanks.

Professor Frederick Wirt and Milbrey McLaughlin served as our reviewers; their insights have guided us in improving the original draft. We are grateful for the guidance of Robert York of the U.S. Office of Education, who served as the technical monitor of our research and acted as a coordinator of many of the administrative details within the Office of Education. We also thank other personnel at USOE for their assistance, particularly the staff of Equal Educational Opportunity programs.

Finally, we would like to thank the Title IV project staffs and their client school districts for responding enthusiastically to our requests for information.

Although this assistance and cooperation have been vital to the completion of our research, responsibility for any errors that remain rests solely with the authors.

CONTENTS

PREFACE iii

SUMMARY v

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS ix

TABLES xiii

Section

I. INTRODUCTION 1
- Expanding the Title IV Focus 1
- Race and Sex—Compatible Issues? 4
- Implications for Sex Desegregation Assistance in Title IV 6
- References 7

II. STUDY METHODOLOGY 8
- Sample Selection 8
- Mail Questionnaires 9
- Site Visits 12
- Debriefings 13

III. PROJECT OFFICE ENVIRONMENT 14
- Institutional Setting 14
- Project Office Interaction with Outside Agencies 20
- Summary 23
- References 24

IV. COMPARATIVE DESCRIPTION OF PROGRAM OPERATIONS 25
- Race Desegregation Activity Profiles 25
- Sex Desegregation Activity Profiles 31
- Influences on Activity Profiles 36
- Interaction with District Personnel in Delivering Services 40

V. PROJECT OFFICE CHARACTERISTICS 43
- Project Director Demographics 43
- Basic Project Demographics 44
- Relationship of Activities to Project Demographic Characteristics 47
- Implementation Problems 52

VI. CLIENT SCHOOL DISTRICTS 61
- District Characteristics 61
- Client District Contacts 63
- Sex Desegregation Activities 66
- Race Desegregation Activities 67
- District Interaction 69
- Summary 78

VII. FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS 80
Summary of Findings 80
Supporting Evidence 82
Recommendations 85
Regional Offices 89
Federal Equal Educational Opportunity Program 89
Concluding Remarks 90

Appendix
A. SPECIMENS OF PRELIMINARY SCREENING FORMS AND SAMPLING FORM TO PROJECT DIRECTORS 91
B. SAMPLE SELECTION 97
C. A BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF MAIL QUESTIONNAIRE CONTENTS 99
D. ACTIVITY CATEGORY DESIGNATIONS 103

TABLES

1. Title IV Grant Allocations: Comparisons of 1974-1975 and 1975-1976 4
2. Mail Questionnaire Return Rate (Project Director) 10
3. Mail Questionnaire Return Rate (Project Staff) 11
4. Competitiveness Ranking of Host Colleges and Universities 15
5. Association of High Competitiveness of Host Institution and Effectiveness of Project 16
6. Association Between Competitiveness and Title IV Activities 17
7. Association Between Competitiveness and Involvement of Host Institution on Project Decisionmaking 17
8. Percent of Project Directors Indicating *High* Levels of Involvement by Host Institution 18
9. Association Between Host Institution Involvement and Usefulness of that Involvement, as Viewed by Project Director 19
10. Percent of Project Directors Reporting *High* Regional Office Participation 21
11. Association Between High Regional Office Participation and High Usefulness of Participation 21
12. Percent of Project Directors Reporting *High* Levels of Participation by Outside Agencies in Planning Title IV Services .. 22
13. Percent of Project Directors Reporting *High* Levels of Support by Outside Agencies in Planning Title IV Services 23
14. Title IV Projects Desegregation Activity Profile 26
15. Desegregation Activities Undertaken More Frequently by One Project Type than Another, by Activity Category 27
16. GAC Race Desegregation Activity Profile: 1975-1976/1974-1975 Project Year Comparison 28
17. SEA Race Desegregation Activity Profile: 1975-1976/1974-1975 Project Year Comparison 28
18. Desegregation Institute Activity Profile: 1975-1976/1974-1975 Project Year Comparison 29
19. Title IV Projects Sex Desegregation Activity Profile 32
20. Extent to Which Project Is Able to Piggyback Sex Desegregation Assistance onto Race Desegregation Program, by Project Type 33
21. Sex Desegregation Activities Undertaken More Frequently by One Project Type than Another, by Activity Category 34
22. Amount of Project Resources Spent on Sex Desegregation Activities, by Project Type 35
23. Perceived Support of Various Internal and External Groups for Race Desegregation Versus Sex Desegregation Assistance, by Project Type 37

24. Relationship Between Support for Race Desegregation Versus Sex Desegregation Assistance and Percent of Project Resources Spent on Sex Desegregation, by Project Type 38
25. Relationship Between Frequently Undertaking Certain Kinds of Race and Sex Desegregation Activities and Amount of Project Resources Spent on Sex Desegregation Work, by Project Type 39
26. Extent to Which Race and Sex Desegregation Activities Are Directed to Various Groups, by Project Type 41
27. Changes in Extent to Which Race Desegregation Activities Are Directed to Certain Groups, by Project Type 42
28. Project Director Characteristics 43
29. Project Office Demographics 44
30. Changes in Project Office Demographics, 1975-1976 to 1976-1977 .. 45
31. Relationship Between Size of Staff and Other Project Office Demographics, by Project Type 46
32. Frequency of Undertaking Activities by Number of Districts Served 48
33. Relationship Between the Size of Staff and Type of Activities Undertaken by GACs and SEAs 49
34. Relationship Between Size of Staff and Amount of Project Resources Spent on Sex Desegregation Work, GACs and SEAs ... 51
35. Staffing Problems 53
36. Method of Contacting Districts 54
37. Organization of Staff 55
38. Institute Program Characteristics 56
39. Relationship Between Staffing Problems and Activity Profiles, by Project Type 57
40. Planning Problems 58
41. Relationship Between Extent to Which Planning Problems Are Experienced and Activities Undertaken, by Project Type 60
42. Client District Characteristics 62
43a. Stage of Compliance with Title IX, by District 63
43b. Stage of Compliance with Desegregation Orders, by District 63
44a. Districts Enacting Sex Desegregation Policy 64
44b. Districts Enacting Race Desegregation Policy 64
45. District Contact Person 65
46. Project Staff Sex Desegregation Activity Profile 66
47. Project Staff Race Desegregation Activity Profile 68
48. Targets of Project Activities 69
49. Reported District Participation in Planning Desegregation Activities 70
50. Reported District Support of Sex Desegregation Versus Race Desegregation 71
51. Relationship Between Targeting District Personnel and Undertaking Activities, by Activity Category 73
52. Implementation Problems 74
53. Project Effectiveness in the District 75

54. Relationship Between Reporting Effectiveness and Undertaking Activities, by Activity Category 76
55. Relationship Between Reporting District Support for Title IV Program and Implementation Problems 77
56. Relationship Between Reporting District Support for Title IV Program and Project Effectiveness 77
57. Relationship Between District Amenability and Effectiveness 78
58. Comparison of Problems of Newly Funded and Continuously Funded Type D Institutes 82
59. GAC and SEA Implementation Problems 84
60. Areas in Which Districts Are Assisted, by Project Type and Program 84
61. Areas of Effectiveness, by Project Type and Program 85
62. Cross-Year Comparisons: Region of Site-Visit Sample 97
63. Types of Sex Desegregation Activities Undertaken by SEAs and GACs 98

I. INTRODUCTION

Title IV of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 authorizes the U.S. Office of Education (USOE) to provide technical assistance and training services to school districts for the purpose of meeting special needs associated with preparing, adopting, and implementing desegregation plans or programs. The assistance is provided through direct financial aid to school districts themselves, as well as through indirect aid made possible through grants and contracts with service organizations that assist school districts. These organizations include the General Assistance Center (GAC), State Education Agency (SEA), and Desegregation Institute. Although Title IV is a national program, it is implemented through regional field offices to accommodate regional diversity.

In 1974, Rand undertook an evaluation of Title IV operations at the request of the Office of Planning, Budgeting and Evaluation (OPBE) of the U.S. Office of Education [1,2]. This was the first HEW sponsored evaluation of Title IV. The main purpose of that study was to describe the Title IV service delivery system and to evaluate current operations to assist federal officials in improving program operations. From that analysis a number of recommendations were made, which included: limiting Institute clients to districts with amenable desegregation environments and including statistical criteria in the awarding of grants to encourage Institutes to undertake follow-up activities with participants; narrowing the scope of SEA activities to information dissemination, unless state commitment to desegregation was high; and funding GACs for multiple years and adding measures of effective organizational characteristics to the criteria for awarding GAC contracts. It was also suggested to USOE that a more explicit federal mission be provided to the program.

A number of recommendations derived from the findings of that study have already been incorporated into the directives given the Title IV projects by USOE. However, at the time data were gathered for the earlier report, Title IV projects were responsible only for school desegregation related services. Since then, Title IV projects have also been given the responsibility for assisting in the elimination of sex discrimination. Conceivably, this additional responsibility could effect important changes in the operations and staffing of these Title IV projects, and most certainly it would change the mix of services delivered to their client school districts. Consequently, at the request of USOE Rand has undertaken a follow-on study to assess the changes that have occurred in Title IV operations under this expanded charter. The main objective of the present study is to assess the impact of adding activities designed to eliminate sexism to the school desegregation activities already conducted under Title IV. This report describes the findings of the follow-on research.

EXPANDING THE TITLE IV FOCUS

Responsibility for helping eliminate sex discrimination was given to Title IV sponsored projects beginning with the 1975-1976 project year. Title IV regulations

incorporated this new responsibility by expanding the definition of "desegregation" to include: "the assignment of students to public schools and within such schools without regard to their race, color, religion, *sex*, or national origin" [3] (italics added). There was no additional appropriation of Title IV funds during this first year to finance the activities undertaken to assist in the elimination of sex discrimination. Organizations applying for Title IV grants were given few directives concerning the activities that might be undertaken to help eliminate sex discrimination. Proposals could be submitted that focused solely on racial discrimination, solely on sex discrimination, or on both. There was a provision, however, to award at least ten grants per fiscal year to Institutes that would primarily focus on training with regard to desegregation on the basis of sex.

The decision to add this new responsibility to Title IV was probably influenced by the need to comply with Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 [4]. Generally, Title IX prohibits sex discrimination in any educational institution receiving federal assistance. This includes the approximately 16,000 public school systems and 2,700 post-secondary institutions in the nation.

Specifically, Title IX requires that school districts and institutions of higher education not: group students by sex in course assignments (including physical education and athletics); or differentiate by sex in financial aid awards, counseling, admissions, or extracurricular activities. It further requires that school districts and institutions of higher education develop:

1. An Affirmative Action Plan (under the requirements of Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964);
2. A self-evaluation or needs assessment with regard to Title IX regulations; and
3. A Title IX Compliance Plan that outlines schedules and techniques for achieving the parity required by Title IX.

Title IX makes no provision for remedying sexism in textbooks or curricula.

In expanding Title IV program responsibilities to include "sex desegregation,"[1] federal officials made certain assumptions. First, by placing both responsibilities under one program, they assumed a certain similarity between them. Second, they assumed that certain scale economies existed that made it more appropriate to combine these two types of assistance through one organization, rather than to create a separate organization to deal with sex desegregation.[2]

In a sense, both of these initial assumptions are valid. Sex discrimination legislation is being enforced for the most part through channels that were originally set up to deal with racial discrimination. Although Title IX was passed as part of the Education Amendments Act of 1972, it is more closely related in concept to Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, which called for similar policies and practices with regard to race. In fact, the first section of the regulations acknowledges this similarity [5]. The connection between the two pieces of legislation may seem

[1] Although the term "desegregation" has traditionally referred to the elimination of the isolation of groups based only on race or national origin, throughout this report we will follow the precedent set by the Title IV regulations and expand the definition of desegregation to include sex.

[2] There is Title IV precedent for creating separate organizations. Respective GACs can choose to write proposals to benefit non-English-dominant minority-group students. These GACs are awarded a Type B (bilingual) center rather than the more general Title IV GAC (referred to as a Type A) center.

complicated, but it is crucial to the placement of Title IX assistance within the sphere of responsibility of the Title IV GAC.

Immediately after the Civil Rights Act was passed, Title IV was operating in the same office as Title VI, one of the strongest sections of the Act. Title VI prohibited any agency that received federal funds from discriminating on the basis of race, but it was passed without a budget appropriation. Initially, responsibility for Title VI was taken by HEW, and since school desegregation was the primary race discrimination concern of HEW, it was housed with Title IV, the other school desegregation related program. School districts were then beginning to desegregate in large numbers, and because of the proximity of the two programs, it might have been difficult to distinguish Title VI *enforcement* from Title IV *technical assistance*. By 1967, Title VI responsibility moved to a new unit in HEW, the Office for Civil Rights (OCR), but Title IV GACs were still heavily involved in writing desegregation plans. Over time, that emphasis changed and it was made clear that Title IV sponsored agencies were to be responsible for assistance in the *implementation* of desegregation activities and not for their development and enforcement, which were the responsibility of the OCR. In the interim, however, Title IV program people had often been involved in controversial desegregation activities [6], and this involvement may have endangered the operation of several Centers by alienating the school district clientele.

In the case of Title IX, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare was careful to retain enforcement responsibility for Title IX in its own Office for Civil Rights, while expanding the mission of Title IV *technical assistance* to sex discrimination. Like Title VI when it was new, no budget appropriation was passed for Title IX assistance during the first year. Additionally, no mention of Title IX is made in the Title IV regulations, so the addition of assistance to eliminate sex discrimination extends the program's responsibility for delivering any civil rights related assistance in an administratively consistent manner. This means that familiarity with already existing civil rights laws would give a Title IV technical assistant a head start on understanding the newer provisions relating to sex discrimination. Similarly, the Title IV organization had already developed a procedure for delivering civil rights related services and had an already established base of districts to which it could offer sex desegregation services as an added part of the ongoing program.

Furthermore, it was felt that adding Title IX assistance to the Title IV workload would be less costly than creating a separate agency. Table 1 illustrates that the mean award did increase for the Title IV GAC, SEA, and Training Institute, but the extent to which these increases reflect the additional sex desegregation services and/or increases in operating costs is not clear.

Even if additional monies *were* allocated for sex desegregation services, certain questions remain unanswered. These include: How *well* can Title IV projects deliver sex desegregation assistance in addition to school desegregation assistance? Does the addition of another area of responsibility dilute the original purpose of Title IV? How do sex desegregation services fit into the already existing service delivery system? This report is centrally concerned with these questions. The extension of Title IV to include the elimination of sex discrimination can be operationally consistent with the original intent of the program *only* if the two types of assistance are philosophically and operationally similar.

Table 1

TITLE IV GRANT ALLOCATIONS: COMPARISONS OF 1974-1975 AND 1975-1976

Year	Number Awarded	Range of Awards[a] ($)	Mean Award[a] ($)	Mean Increase[b] ($)	Percent of Appropriation[c]
			GAC		
1974-1975	26	184 to 562.2	340.2	+ 25,607	46
1975-1976	26	198.2 to 894.8	376.3		48
			SEA		
1974-1975	39	20 to 324	128.9	+ 7,330	23
1975-1976	44	20 to 349.6	125.1		25
			Institute		
1974-1975	47	19.3 to 274.5	93.4	+ 29,546	20
1975-1976	17	48.9 to 237.4	147.8		17

[a] In thousands of dollars rounded off to nearest hundredth.

[b] Among those projects funded in both years.

[c] Excludes awards made directly to school districts, which were not included in this year's analysis.

RACE AND SEX—COMPATIBLE ISSUES?

On the surface, it appears that race discrimination and sex discrimination are philosophically and operationally related. This assumption has been made by policymakers and for the most part is routinely accepted by theorists. Much of the literature on sex discrimination goes back to the basic tenet of the 1954 *Brown* decision that separate educational facilities are inherently unequal. Indeed, the entire Women's Movement has been identified more and more closely with the Civil Rights Movement during the last five years. In some respects, the literatures on the two kinds of discrimination support this trend: Each focuses on the victimization of the "affected" group (minorities or women) by society as a whole. Census figures and labor market analyses tend to confirm this view—white males have the highest median income (and years of education) [7]. They are followed by minority males, white females, and minority females, in that order. In school districts, however, one begins to find some indications that problems of race and sex discrimination are different in important ways, and this may have several implications for Title IV service delivery.

The first respect in which race discrimination differs from sex discrimination in the schools is the way in which it is being remedied. Racial desegregation of the public schools has been the most publicized means of remedying race discrimination, and it is the one most frequently ordered by the courts. This desegregation effort typically involves the reassignment of students to schools and within schools

so that no school or classroom deviates significantly from the local population in racial mix. Other remedies are often suggested as auxiliary to the main effort, but the primary thrust of ending race discrimination in the schools has been aimed at physical desegregation and, concomitantly, pupil reassignment. Most of the negative reaction to desegregation has been attributed to the real or imagined inconvenience, danger, loss of opportunity, and/or loss of status occasioned by this pupil reassignment.

The sex desegregation of public schools is for the most part confined to eliminating inequities, including ending within-school separation by sex wherever feasible. No large-scale reassignment of pupils is required or contemplated, since for the most part public schools in this country are coeducational. In addition, the major thrust of Title IX is to make the same options *available* to girls as to boys and vice versa, not to make any set of options mandatory. That is, traditionally all male metalworking and all female home economics classes would be open to both sexes—it would not be mandatory that equal proportions of girls and boys be assigned to them. The same holds true for intramural and interscholastic sports (where no body contact is involved)—golf, tennis, swimming, and track teams can now be made up of both sexes—if both sexes wish to participate. Thus, the element of free choice or voluntarism exists, which is not the case in the remedies proposed for race discrimination. Correspondingly, public reaction has been more subdued—as of this writing, there have been no national reports of gyms being burned, or of home economics classes being boycotted. The overt remedy of physical desegregation is much simpler and less emotionally explosive for sex than for race.

This is not to imply that sex discrimination in the public schools is easier to remedy than race discrimination, only that the first-order solution—physical desegregation—is simpler. As with race desegregation, the removal of physical barriers is only the first step. At that point, the literature suggests it is crucial that the school confront institutional and personal racism in an attempt to create a truly equal educational system [8]. Although there is less agreement on this point, the same is true for sex discrimination [9]. The problem here is that both racism and sexism depend upon a series of overt and subtle behaviors and beliefs for their sustenance. Sexism may be somewhat more thoroughly integrated into society, since it represents a fundamental means of categorizing people that is common to most cultures, including societies that have few other formalized bases for stratification (e.g., socioeconomic status, race, and occupation). As Westervelt points out, the notions of "womanly" behavior are embedded in Judeo-Christian ethic and cannot easily be legislated away. In fact, a significant number of the "target group" themselves do not feel victimized. Therefore, the political constituency and social pressure for facilitating equality between the sexes may be weaker than for racial desegregation. Yet, we have seen the difficulty in legislating away racial discrimination during the past twenty years. Sex discrimination, which is much more deeply imbedded in the culture, may be a more insidious and long-lasting problem.

In summary, we do not suggest that the problems of racism are nearly over; they are not. It is our assertion, however, that since the history and attributes of racism are somewhat different in nature than those of sexism, the remedies for the two problems should be somewhat different.

IMPLICATIONS FOR SEX DESEGREGATION ASSISTANCE IN TITLE IV

The differences between sex discrimination and racial discrimination pose several interesting implications for the delivery of services to remedy sex discrimination by Title IV projects. First, since Title IX addresses only the more physical aspects of sex discrimination in education, what activities are Title IV projects undertaking that are aimed at changing more subtle discriminatory behaviors and attitudes? Who are the targeted district level participants for these activities? Are they a different group from those involved in the project's school desegregation activities? Are they in positions that enable them to enforce the provisions of Title IX? These questions should be answered to understand the role of sex desegregation assistance in Title IV.

Next, although racism and sexism are somewhat different in nature, and may require different remedies, the fact that there was no specific appropriation for services to eliminate sex discrimination may mean that administratively Title IV projects had to "piggyback" their services—delivering both services together. This would suggest that the only districts to receive help from Title IV in eliminating sex discrimination would also be recipients of race desegregation related services. Or, conversely, that the *participants* involved in Title IV sex desegregation related services would also be receiving race desegregation related services. The addition of sex desegregation activities to ongoing racial desegregation assistance programs could lead to a reduction in the amount or quality of race desegregation activities offered by the projects as a result of spreading themselves too thin. Or it could lead to two different groups of client districts for the Title IV projects, one of the two receiving most of the services designed to remedy sex discrimination. Since there were no guidelines or directives issued to Title IV projects when the new responsibility was added, it is difficult to tell what the mix of services or extent of piggybacking will be.

It is also difficult to predict what effect such piggybacking would have on the projects' ongoing school desegregation programs. Will more districts seek the projects' services because of the wider client base created by adding sex desegregation services? Will those districts that are primarily involved in some crucial school desegregation programs see the project as diluting its efforts in that area? These questions are difficult to answer, but crucial to the success of Title IV as a general-purpose civil rights assistance program.

The following sections will begin to address these questions. Section II presents the methodology of the study. Section III sets the stage for the discussion of project operations by describing the environment in which these Title IV projects operate. A comparative description of program operations is provided in Sec. IV, and Sec. V describes the characteristics of the project offices. In Sec. VI, the client school districts and the outcome of the projects' service delivery at the district level are described. Our findings and recommendations for improving and strengthening Title IV are set forth in Sec. VII.

REFERENCES

1. Crocker, Stephen, et al., *Title IV of the Civil Rights Act of 1964: A Review of Program Operations. Executive Summary*, The Rand Corporation, R-1901/1-HEW, August 1976.
2. Crocker, Stephen, et al., *Title IV of the Civil Rights Act of 1964: A Review of Program Operations*, The Rand Corporation, R-1901/2-HEW, August 1976.
3. *Federal Register*, Vol. 41, No. 7, January 12, 1976, part 180.02.
4. Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 (20 U.S.C. sect. 1681 ff.). Regulations, signed 27 May 1976, were published in the *Federal Register*, Vol. 40, No. 108, June 4, 1975.
5. *Federal Register*, Vol. 40, No. 108, June 4, 1975, part 86, paragraph 1.
6. Egerton, John, *Title IV of the Civil Rights Act of 1964: A Program in Search of a Mission*, Race Relations Information Center, Atlanta, 1971.
7. 1970 Census—*General Social and Economic Characteristics*, United States Summary, U.S. Department of Commerce, 1972.
8. Orfield, Gary, *The Reconstruction of Southern Education*, Wiley, New York, 1969.
9. Westervelt, Eleanor M., "Femininity in American Women: The Influence of Education," *Journal of National Association of Women Deans and Counselors*, Fall 1971, pp. 585-622.

II. STUDY METHODOLOGY

The methodology used in this evaluation is similar to that used in the prior Rand study. It combines the statistical analysis of responses to mail questionnaires with case study material based upon site visits to Title IV projects and to the school districts that are their clients. It does, however, differ from the previous methodology in several significant respects.

First, the focus of the prior study was on field visits. Because of the heavy emphasis on fieldwork, staff knowledge and understanding of Title IV projects were increased. Hence, for the present study we have been able to rely more heavily on the analysis of mail questionnaire data. The use of these data in standardized response form has made a more quantitative approach to analysis possible, but it has also decreased the flexibility of the study by limiting the policy-manipulable variables to those that were measured in the mail questionnaires.

Second, because of a budget limitation, the scope of the study was reduced by USOE. School districts receiving Title IV grants (direct-funded Local Education Agencies) were eliminated from the study. Because the program had made few administrative changes, visits to regional offices were also excluded from this study. Finally, the site-visit sample was severely curtailed; fewer GACs and SEAs were visited this year compared to last year and no Institutes were visited. This latter policy proved deleterious to interpreting Institute questionnaire responses. Since this was the first year Title IV has funded Institutes solely to train school personnel on issues related to sex discrimination, the lack of site visits to this new type of Title IV organization forced us to interpret the responses from these organizations in terms of our prior knowledge of Title IV funded Institutes (which focused solely on training related to racial desegregation). This reduced site-visit schedule meant that the data gathered in the prior study were critical for the formulation of questionnaire items and their interpretation.

In addition to these methodological differences, the focus of the policy recommendations that will be made is very different from that of the prior study. The earlier study focused on a review of program operations and a description of the Title IV program; the present study examines the impact that the addition of the Title IX mission has had on key variables identified in that description. It is to be stressed that this is not a longitudinal study in the formal sense. Many variables that were identified previously are now being measured for the first time. Where cross-year comparisons are possible, they will be made, but the *primary* intent of this study is to compare the Title IV projects' reports of characteristics and activities with their problems and effectiveness *in* the desegregation and sex discrimination related aspects of their programs. The following sections will describe the components of the study's methodology in greater detail.

SAMPLE SELECTION

As mentioned above, only GACs and SEAs were to be site-visited. The site-visit sample consisted of eight GACs and eight SEAs, drawn from those GACs and SEAs

in the same or neighboring states, that were offering assistance in remedying sex discrimination. To identify projects that were offering such assistance, screening forms were sent to all GACs and SEAs. In these forms, the project directors were asked if they were undertaking sex desegregation services this year, and to list up to eight districts in their service areas that had received such services from them or would receive them by April 1, 1976.[1] Data from these forms were used to select the GAC and SEA site-visit sample.

Wherever possible, GACs and SEAs from the 1975 site-visited sample were selected to enhance data comparability between the two studies. However, after eliminating projects that were not yet involved in sex desegregation services in three or more districts, it was necessary to add three GACs and four SEAs to the sampling pool to arrive at the desired site-visit sample size of eight GACs with eight SEAs from the same state or service area. Whenever possible, the replacement of a GAC/SEA cluster was made with a GAC and SEA from the same geographic region to maintain the regional balance criterion used in the previous study.

Twenty-four client school districts of the sixteen projects were also selected for field visits. Whenever possible, the three client districts that were visited for each GAC and SEA cluster were receiving services from both projects. Where this was not possible, two districts were selected for the GAC and one for the SEA (on the principle that GACs receive roughly twice the proportion of the Title IV appropriation that SEAs do). The screening form also requested the projects to provide a brief description of the sex desegregation activities undertaken in a given client district. These descriptions were used to select the sample of client districts that represented as many varied types of sex desegregation services as possible.[2]

MAIL QUESTIONNAIRES

Two types of mail questionnaires were sent to all GACs, SEAs, and Institutes. The first type was a project director questionnaire, which asked for overall information about the project, its operations, problems, and staff characteristics. The second was a project staff questionnaire, asking the staff members to describe the activities undertaken *with a specific school district* and to assess the problems and effectiveness they felt they were having in that district. Each questionnaire asked the same or parallel questions for racial desegregation and sex desegregation services.[3]

Making the staff questionnaires district-specific was a departure from last year's methodology. In our previous study, the staff questionnaires were designed to elicit overall information on the work performed by a Title IV staff member. However, it was readily apparent from last year's fieldwork that Title IV staff do not undertake a uniform set of activities in all of the districts in which they work; rather, the activities undertaken in each district differ *depending on the characteristics and needs of each district.* Therefore, for the present study the staff questionnaires were designed to elicit district-specific information so that we could control for the varying characteristics of the districts in our analyses.

[1] Specimens of these forms appear as Appendix A.

[2] A more detailed description of the sample selection appears as Appendix B.

[3] A summary description of the questionnaires appears as Appendix C.

For each project office, information was to be collected from staff members on two client school districts. These school districts were selected in advance by Rand and instructions were given to the project directors to distribute the staff questionnaires to the staff member(s) who had primary responsibility for delivering race desegregation and/or sex desegregation services to the district previously selected. In the case of the GACs and SEAs, these districts were selected randomly from those listed on the screening forms described earlier. Directors of institutes whose primary focus was race desegregation (also called Desegregation Institutes or Type D Institutes) were contacted by telephone and were asked for a list of any districts to which they were providing sex desegregation services. For each project office we then selected two districts randomly from these lists. Directors of Institutes whose sole focus was sex desegregation services (Type S Institutes) were contacted and asked to provide us with a list of the districts served by them. In turn, these lists were used to randomly select two districts on which to collect information from their staff members.

As was the case in the previous year's study, our mail questionnaire response rate was unusually high. Table 2 reports these rates for the project director questionnaires. As can be seen in Table 3, the staff questionnaire response rate, although somewhat lower, nonetheless was also very high and more than adequate to provide us with a base from which to quantify the dependent variables.[4]

Table 2

MAIL QUESTIONNAIRE RETURN RATE
(PROJECT DIRECTOR)

Project Type	Number Eligible	Number Returned	Return Rate (%)
GAC	26	24	92
SEA	44	37	84
Type D TI	17	14	82
Type S TI	11	9	82
Total	98	84	86

The presence of a series of dependent variables is also a departure from our 1975 methodology. The prior Rand study was somewhat handicapped in this respect because it was an exploratory effort. No previous work of this type had been done, and there was no consensus as to what Title IV outcomes could be expected. As a result, no dependent variable could be objectively identified. However, from

[4] This response rate is particularly remarkable when one considers that in many instances the district-specific method of distributing questionnaires may have left a given staff member with more than one extremely detailed questionnaire to complete! And, when race desegregation and sex desegregation assistance were the responsibility of different staff members, two questionnaires had to be completed for the district. We have no comparable response rate figures for surveys that used this type of distribution plan, but given the standard response rate of 56 percent for one-respondent/one-questionnaire surveys, it appears that ours are quite satisfactory.

Table 3

MAIL QUESTIONNAIRE RETURN RATE
(PROJECT STAFF)

Project Type	Number Eligible	Number Returned	Return Rate (%)
GAC	64	63	98
SEA	86	69	80
Type D TI	37	25	68
Type S TI	21	13	62
Total	208	170	82

the extensive fieldwork conducted last year we were able to identify certain variables that appeared to have had an important effect on the operations of the Title IV projects. Making use of these interview data and the knowledge gained during our previous study, this year we were able to develop a series of outcome variables for inclusion on the mail questionnaires. These variables can be grouped into three categories: (1) *implementation problems*, (2) *effectiveness*, and (3) *strain*. *Implementation problems* are those problems a Title IV project might typically have in carrying out its services in a given district. They include:

1. Gaining the confidence of the superintendent;
2. Getting the appropriate level of district personnel to participate;
3. Finding district personnel who are willing to implement activities;
4. Keeping participants actively involved for the duration of the activity;
5. Delivering appropriate assistance;
6. Obtaining feedback from district central office staff;
7. Communicating with the participant after the assistance for training ends.

Indicators of *effectiveness* were identified to assess project accomplishments in those areas in which a project's services might typically have the most impact on the practices of a given district. These include persuading:

1. Districts to change their *personnel* selection procedures;
2. Districts to change their pupil *placement* procedures;
3. Those who received training to use new *materials;*
4. Those who received training to use new *methods or procedures;*
5. Persons who received training to change *course content;*
6. Persons who received training to change their *attitudes* toward sex discrimination and/or racial and ethnic discrimination;
7. Districts to change their *programs or policies.*

These indicators of effectiveness and implementation problems were analyzed for both race desegregation and sex desegregation activities.

We labeled the final set of dependent variables *strain*, or problems that, if experienced, could create difficulty for the project in implementing its program as intended. Such problems might be encountered:

1. While trying to staff the project;
2. While trying to plan the project's program;
3. When working with other agencies.

In addition to the dependent variables specified above, we also categorized the race desegregation and sex desegregation activities undertaken by the projects into conceptually related groups and used these activity categories as dependent variables in the analysis. For example, we categorized the sex desegregation activities into two groups by stages of compliance with Title IX. Title IX requires school districts to enact certain policies and procedures and to do so by stages or within certain time frames. We identified those sex desegregation activities that Title IV projects would probably undertake to assist school districts in complying with the first stage of Title IX, and distinguished them from activities that they might undertake to assist districts in meeting the second-order compliance of Title IX (or *Stage 2*) activities. Examples of *Stage 1* activities include: helping districts develop procedures to insure students equal access to courses regardless of their sex; and helping districts establish procedures that would eliminate sex discrimination in staff hiring or assignment. *Stage 2* activities included such activities as: helping districts establish procedures for identifying textbooks containing sex stereotypes; and developing curricula that can be used to supplement information on contributions of women to society.[5]

Race desegregation activities were also broken down into groups of conceptually similar activities: those related to in-service *training* of district staff; *programmatic* activities concerned with introducing districts to different materials or procedures; activities or plans concerned with developing or implementing *desegregation*; and *technical assistance* activities related to the smooth administration of desegregation related efforts. Only activities undertaken by all project types were used in development of activity categories. These categories included most but not all of the activities on the mail questionnaire. In some cases in the analysis the activity categories are used as dependent variables, while in others they appear as independent variables. This is appropriate because of the different levels of analysis used: At the project office level (from the project director questionnaires), activities are seen primarily as dependent variables, or outcomes of particular configurations of project type and project office characteristics. At the district level (from the staff questionnaires), activities are seen as independent variables, which in combination with particular configurations of project office characteristics and district characteristics impact on the effectiveness and implementation problems of the project.

SITE VISITS

Site visits were conducted by one staff member who spent one week in a given state or region. During this time he or she visited a GAC, an SEA, and three of their client districts which were selected by the method described earlier. Since this was the second visit for over half of the sampled projects, and since smaller numbers of clients were involved, it was possible to eliminate the team approach used in site visits during the previous year's study. Whenever possible, a staff member was sent

[5] A complete listing of the activities by their conceptual category is included in Appendix D.

to the same regions of the country visited the previous year, on the assumptions that the area and its particular desegregation problems would be somewhat more familiar to the investigator, and respondents would be more familiar, and therefore more frank, with the interviewer.

It was hoped that this technique would result in more insights by the staff member into the project. These insights were then to be shared at the debriefings and would serve to validate the data analysis findings.

At the Title IV project offices, the project director and staff members responsible for delivering services to the sampled client school districts were interviewed. At the client school districts, the person who served as the primary district contact for the Title IV project was interviewed; additionally, district personnel who were recipients of the project's services were interviewed as time allowed. Staff members on site visits used open-ended interview checklists which assured that certain topics central to the conceptual framework of the study were covered. All of those involved in site visits this year are principals in both this year's research and in the previous year's study.

DEBRIEFINGS

Debriefings were held twice during the course of the fieldwork: after the first three trips, and again after all fieldwork was completed. Staff members were responsible for field notes and project summaries, but the most valuable part of this year's debriefings was the clarification of descriptions made possible by the fact that so many of the projects had been visited before. As a result, the discussions of project characteristics this year could be more closely connected to a conceptual base, and specific variables were more easily identified. In this way, the debriefings set the stage for data analysis, allowing it to proceed in a more directed fashion than was possible before. The following sections describe the results of this data analysis, beginning with Sec. III, which describes the environment in which Title IV projects operate.

III. PROJECT OFFICE ENVIRONMENT

Before examining the operations of these four Title IV project offices and their characteristics, it is important to set the stage by discussing the larger environment in which these projects function. In a sense this is our macro-level analysis, even though this year's research effort was narrowly focused at the micro, or project office and client school district levels.

From our previous research we know that Title IV projects are influenced by their relationship with other institutions. For example, last year we found the projects' institutional setting to be a critical factor influencing the type of program offered by the projects: The primary source threatening the GAC's school desegregation activities was likely to be its own host university; an SEA needed a high level of state commitment for it to be judged effective; and Desegregation Institutes needed to work in districts with amenable desegregation environments or else they tended to follow standard teacher training approaches found in university schools of education. Thus, this year we examined the extent to which various characteristics of the institutional setting were associated with the activities undertaken by the Title IV project offices, and the problems they reported experiencing while trying to implement their programs. This, we hoped, would increase our understanding of the influence of the institutional setting on the service delivery of the Title IV projects.

Understanding the connection between Title IV projects and institutions or agencies external to them is important for several reasons. First, we would like to know if the institutional setting of the Title IV sponsored GAC, SEA, or TI has any effect on the types of services offered, the implementation or organizational problems they experience, or their ultimate effectiveness. Next, it is important to understand if the organizational mission of the project type, as it relates to race desegregation or sex desegregation work, seems to be enhanced or hindered by a certain institutional setting. Finally, the interaction of the Title IV project with various other agencies may have important implications for the organizational mission and effectiveness of the project. The following section will describe those relationships and discuss the implications for Title IV service delivery.

INSTITUTIONAL SETTING

Title IV GACs and Institutes are usually located in colleges or universities. One of our impressions from last year's fieldwork was that the prestige of the college or university at which the GAC or TI was located was one of the determining factors in the project's success or failure at the district level. This year's study afforded us the opportunity to test this impression. Barron's Competitiveness Index[1] was used as a measure of the prestige or competitiveness of the institutions at which GACs and TIs are housed.

[1] This Competitiveness Index [1] ranks colleges and universities on the basis of their selectivity in undergraduate admissions. The schools are ranked in descending order from six to one based on the

Table 4 illustrates the range of rankings for the host institutions at which most GACs and TIs are located.

As can be seen from the table, there is not a great deal of variation between the competitiveness of the host institutions of the three project types. The most notable distinction is that GACs have a somewhat higher range and mean than the TIs, but this difference is not statistically significant.[2] This does not mean, however, that the differences have no significant effects on the operation of Title IV projects within these colleges and universities. On the contrary, one would expect the GAC, which usually functions semiautonomously from its host institution, to be affected *least* in its operations, no matter what the prestige or competitiveness of the host; while TIs, which typically operate from the School or Department of Education and use regular university faculty for staff, would be affected *most* by the prestige or competitiveness of the host institution. These expectations were generally borne out.

Table 4

COMPETITIVENESS RANKING OF HOST COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

Project Type	Number Ranked[a]	Range	Mean
GAC	24	2-6	3.19
Type D TI	16	1-5.5	2.59
Type S TI	11	1-4	2.68

[a]Number ranked includes all Title IV institutions included in *Barron's Profiles* and is not limited to respondents on mail questionnaire.

As Table 5 indicates, an examination of the association between competitiveness of institution and effectiveness shows that the GACs and TIs that are located at more competitive institutions regard themselves as more successful in their sex desegregation activities. The most success indicated by more competitive GACs and Type S TIs was in the area of attitude change, while Type D TIs experienced the most success in district adoption of policies and procedures. In race desegregation assistance, GACs housed at more competitive institutions still regarded themselves as most effective in attitude change, but they regarded themselves as slightly *ineffective* in affirmative action areas. Type D TIs housed at more competitive institutions saw themselves as *ineffective* in attitude change.

median Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT) scores for the most recent freshman class. (The SAT is the admissions selector most widely used by colleges and universities in the United States. It is developed and administered by the College Entrance Examination Board of the Educational Testing Service in Princeton, New Jersey.) We recognize that this index is a rough approximation of prestige, but it confirmed staff impressions of a number of the institutions with which we were familiar, while giving a more objective criterion for the measurement of prestige.

[2] T-tests and F-tests produced values that did not reject the null hypothesis.

Table 5

ASSOCIATION OF HIGH COMPETITIVENESS OF HOST INSTITUTION AND EFFECTIVENESS OF PROJECT

Success Felt in Getting Participants to Change	GAC		Type D TI		Type S TI
	Race	Sex	Race	Sex	Sex
Personnel selection procedures	-.278	.142	--	--	0.0
Student-related procedures and policies	.113	.148	.041	.563	-.132
Instructional procedures	.020	.181	.063	.296	-.250
Attitudes	.235	.357[a]	-.299	.148	.331

[a]Significant at the .05 level. The coefficients reported in this table, and, unless otherwise indicated, throughout this report, are taus [2]. Taus are used instead of the more familiar Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient (r), since the latter assumes interval data--an assumption which cannot be made for many of our variables. However, in certain specified places r's are reported when the data have interval properties.

Tau B's are reported when r = c; when r ≠ c, tau C's are reported. For each project type it requires a different strength before the coefficient reaches statistical significance, since significance is based on both the distribution of the data and the size of the sample.

The problems associated with competitiveness of the host institution also varied for the GAC and both types of TI. Competitiveness of host institution of the Type D TI was associated with fewer overall implementation problems in sex desegregation assistance, while it had a negligible relationship to such problems in race desegregation assistance. For the Type S TI, competitiveness of the host was associated with slightly more implementation problems—notably, problems with participants: getting appropriate participants, keeping them involved, and executing follow-up programs. The GAC with a more competitive host institution reported problems in only one such area—getting appropriate participants. It is expected that GACs and Type S TIs are experiencing this problem for similar reasons: GACs and Type S TIs housed at competitive institutions may, simply because of the reputation of the host institution, be attracting large numbers of participants who may or may not be actively involved in Title IX in their districts.

Competitiveness of the host institution is also associated with the activities undertaken, particularly for the TI. Both Type D and Type S TIs tend to undertake *Stage 1* sex desegregation activities to a greater extent when housed at a more competitive host institution. Table 6 indicates that both GACs and Type D TIs tend to undertake *training* activities more frequently when housed at a more competitive institution. These data suggest that the incentives in the university, particularly the more prestigious university, may be aimed toward the accomplishment of those Title IV activities that are more compatible with its own purposes—teacher training. These data further suggest that this association is more likely to work a hardship on the GAC, which, as a broader-based and more general-purpose organization, must meet the diverse needs of many client districts, rather than on the TI, which generally deals only with the in-service training needs of a few. The GAC

Table 6

ASSOCIATION BETWEEN COMPETITIVENESS AND TITLE IV ACTIVITIES

Activity Undertaken	GAC	Type D TI	Type S TI
Sex desegregation			
Stage 1	.044	.531[a]	.438
Stage 2	-.033	-.168	-.231
Race desegregation			
Training	.317[b]	.479[b]	NA
Programmatic	-.036	.303	NA
Technical assistance	.061	.339	NA
Desegregation	.095	.325	NA

[a]Significant at the .05 level.

[b]Significant at the .01 level.

may feel somewhat hamstrung in continuing to provide a wide range of services if the more competitive host institution indicates that the GAC should be focused on training. The data in Table 7 provide further credence to this hypothesis. The more competitive the institution, the greater its involvement in decisions as to what activities a GAC should undertake. This same relationship did not hold for either type of Institute. Instead, the more competitive their host institution, the more involved the institution in decisions concerning project staffing, budget, and organization. These associations were expected for the TIs: TIs are very closely connected with their host institutions and a majority of their staff usually have other university responsibilities in addition to Title IV. Thus, we would expect the host institution of the TIs to take an active part in their internal management.

The host institution of the Title IV SEA is the State Department of Education. In our previous report we pointed out that the commitment of the State Department to desegregation was crucial to the effectiveness of the Title IV SEA as an

Table 7

ASSOCIATION BETWEEN COMPETITIVENESS AND INVOLVEMENT OF HOST INSTITUTION ON PROJECT DECISIONMAKING

Type of Involvement	GAC	Type D TI	Type S TI
In decisions on activities undertaken	.265	.007	.100
In decisions on project staffing	.069	.488[a]	.321
In decisions on budget and project organizations	.168	.340[b]	.735[a]

[a]Significant at the .01 level.

[b]Significant at the .05 level.

agent of change. While 50 percent of the SEAs responding to this year's questionnaire indicated that their state had passed some form of race desegregation legislation, 67 percent indicated that the state had passed legislation against sex discrimination. In addition, 40 percent indicated that the Chief State School Officer had taken a position in favor of the Equal Rights Amendment. Since, as of this writing, 34 states have ratified the Equal Rights Amendment, this suggests that the State Departments of Education are somewhat more committed to ending sex discrimination in education than to ending racial segregation in public schools. If this is the case, the Title IV SEA should have a high degree of success in delivering services to eliminate sex discrimination.

The connection between Title IV SEA directors and the State Departments they serve is strong: 65 percent indicate that they serve the State Department in some additional capacity; 95 percent of the directors reported that the State Department saw their assistance in ending sex discrimination as beneficial, compared to 85 percent for their school desegregation assistance. The SEA directors see their connection to the State Department as beneficial for delivering both race and sex desegregation assistance. Ninety-two percent indicated that their client districts regarded their connection to the state as beneficial; 89 percent saw the districts as welcoming sex desegregation assistance from the SEA; and 69 percent saw them welcoming race desegregation assistance. This paints a picture of most State Departments as committed to sex desegregation assistance, and implies that the host institution of the Title IV SEA is somewhat more receptive to sex desegregation assistance than to race desegregation.

Host Institution Involvement in Project Decisionmaking

The SEAs and Type D TIs report far higher levels of involvement by their host institutions in decisionmaking. For the sake of convenience, the involvement has been divided into the three categories mentioned earlier: involvement in decisions on activities undertaken, in decisions on project staffing, and in decisions on budget and project organization. Table 8 illustrates the levels of involvement reported for each of these three areas.

The higher levels of involvement indicated by the SEA are somewhat expected: The previous Rand study indicated that Title IV SEAs are heavily dependent upon their State Departments of Education. The State's high degree of involvement in

Table 8

PERCENT OF PROJECT DIRECTORS INDICATING *HIGH* LEVELS OF INVOLVEMENT BY HOST INSTITUTION

Type of Involvement	GAC	SEA	Type D TI	Type S TI
In decisions on activities undertaken	14	44	49	20
In decisions on staffing of project	23	39	32	24
In decisions on budget and project organization	44	60	45	48

Type D TIs can also be explained by a finding from the previous research: The TI is typically a part of the school of education in the college or university at which it is located. One might typically have expected Type S TIs to follow this pattern, but they do not. Since we visited no TIs in this year's sample, we are somewhat handicapped in our explanation of this, but we speculate that three things may be in operation. First, the Type S TI is operating in a new area, one which the host institution may know or care relatively little about. Second, although this is their first year of operation as a Type S TI, their personnel may have a high degree of previous experience in dealing with sex discrimination. As a result, the staff of the Type S TI may be recognized as experts on Title IX. Third, since only 22 percent of Type S TI project directors had previous positions within their host institutions, whereas 74 percent of Type D TI directors had previous positions within their institutions, the Type S TI director may be less tied into the administrative and academic network of the school of education than is typical for an Institute director. Having fewer ties may mean that they receive less direct or indirect control by the college administration.

Usefulness of Host Institution Involvement

In general, Type S TIs and GACs do not see high levels of involvement by their host institution as useful, while Type D TIs and SEAs do. Table 9 illustrates this point.

It is possible that the reason Type D TIs and Type S TIs look so different in this respect is that Type D TIs are more integrated into their host institutions. Being more closely connected to their schools, the directors may be more likely to see collegial participation as useful than the Type S TI directors, who may have developed few of these relationships with colleges or administrators in the School of Education at which their Institutes are located. Since the SEA is closely connected to the State Department of Education, and somewhat more dependent upon it for policy support than any of the other project types, it is understandable that a relatively high level of involvement would be welcomed. In the SEA, involvement of the host institution would probably not be regarded as interference, but rather as State Department support of the SEA program and connection of the SEA into

Table 9

ASSOCIATION BETWEEN HOST INSTITUTION INVOLVEMENT AND USEFULNESS OF THAT INVOLVEMENT, AS VIEWED BY PROJECT DIRECTOR

Type of Involvement	GAC	SEA	Type D TI	Type S TI
In decisions on activities undertaken	.167	.433[a]	.761[b]	.324
In decisions on staffing of project	-.021	.365[b]	.425	.000
In decisions on budget and project organization	.389[b]	.423[a]	.609[b]	-.174

[a]Significant at the .01 level.

[b]Significant at the .05 level.

the mainstream of State Department policy. Since Title IV SEAs primarily undertake technical assistance and information dissemination, this connection becomes even more important. The Title IV SEA that acts without the involvement of the State Department must be careful not to isolate itself from its primary source of influence and credibility—the State Department of Education. Further, since 65 percent of the SEA project directors who responded to the mail questionnaire have other responsibilities within the State Department, there may be a natural carryover of Title IV SEA work into other areas of the State Department.

Slightly more involvement of the State Department is reported by project directors who *do not* have other responsibilities, but our fieldwork experience suggests a rationale for this. In SEAs whose director was responsible for other areas of State Department of Education work in addition to Title IV, there was a great deal of *informal* involvement of the State Department in project decisionmaking. Projects in which the Title IV unit was more isolated tended to be characterized by more *formalized* involvement of the State Department. As a result, the degree of involvement of State Departments within the Title IV SEAs appeared similarly high in all the SEAs, but more formalized where the project director had fewer outside responsibilities.

In general, substantial involvement of the host institution in determining project activities is not significantly associated with the extent to which projects report experiencing implementation problems or perceive effectiveness. Nor was substantial involvement of the host institution in staffing decisions significantly associated with the extent to which projects reported experiencing staffing problems. There was a tendency for SEAs that reported a high level of host involvement in staffing decisions to also report a larger percentage of female and minority staff members, but again the associations were not statistically significant.

Thus, we see that SEAs and Type D TIs report the greatest amount of host institution involvement in decisionmaking of any of the project types and, furthermore, they regard this great extent of involvement as useful. However, our data did not show an association between the involvement of the host institution in project decisionmaking and the extent to which the projects report experiencing problems or the extent to which projects perceive themselves to be effective. This suggests that while the host institution of the Title IV projects may influence their internal organization, there are other forces operating that more strongly affect the outcomes of their service delivery.

PROJECT OFFICE INTERACTION WITH OUTSIDE AGENCIES

We turn now to an examination of the interaction of Title IV projects with other outside agencies. For the purpose of this study, these outside agencies most frequently contacted are categorized in the following fashion: (1) the State Boards of Education; (2) the host institutions; (3) the regional offices; and (4) the client school districts. Looking first at the participation of the regional office in project operations, we see from the data in Tables 10 and 11 that the SEA reports both the highest degree of regional office participation and the highest degree of usefulness of that participation. It is also interesting to note that all project types report the highest amount of regional office participation in the interpretation of guidelines.

Table 10

PERCENT OF PROJECT DIRECTORS REPORTING
HIGH REGIONAL OFFICE PARTICIPATION

Area of Participation	GAC	SEA	Type D TI	Type S TI
Selection of client districts, participants	16	38	44	28
Determination of activities	22	41	38	37
Internal project organization	36	47	34	30
Interpretation of guidelines	40	74	64	56

Table 11

ASSOCIATION BETWEEN HIGH REGIONAL OFFICE PARTICIPATION
AND HIGH USEFULNESS OF PARTICIPATION

Area of Participation	GAC	SEA	Type D TI	Type S TI
Selection of client districts, participants	.430[a]	.688[b]	.557[a]	.855[c]
Determination of activities	.408[c]	.594[b]	.542[a]	.236
Internal project organization	.524[c]	.569[b]	.523[a]	.902[c]
Interpretation of guidelines	.713[b]	.575[c]	.654[c]	.644[a]

[a]Significant at the .05 level.

[b]Significant at the .01 level.

[c]Significant at the .001 level.

Furthermore, all of the project types find the participation of the regional office to be extremely useful, regardless of the area in which they are involved.

Unlike the GACs and Desegregation Institutes, SEAs experience the same level of participation by outside agencies for both their sex desegregation and race desegregation programs, as the data in Table 12 illustrate. General Assistance Centers and Desegregation Institutes report that they interact with outside agencies to a lesser extent in planning their sex desegregation activities than their race desegregation activities. It may be that the area of sex desegregation assistance is so new that the GACs and TIs do not yet have a network of involved outsiders who can advise them in planning such assistance. Alternatively, GACs and Desegregation Institutes may find the Title IX guidelines and the remedies that are forthcoming from these guidelines so straightforward that they perceive relatively little need for help from outside agencies in planning their sex desegregation program. The SEA, on the other hand, which is more tied into the network of professional education, may be more used to interacting with outside agencies. If the SEA is primarily involved in information dissemination and technical assistance, it may also be serving an education function with those outside agencies as it involves them in planning functions. We know, for example, that in one of the State Depart-

Table 12

PERCENT OF PROJECT DIRECTORS REPORTING *HIGH* LEVELS
OF PARTICIPATION BY OUTSIDE AGENCIES
IN PLANNING TITLE IV SERVICES

Type of Program	GAC	SEA	Type D TI	Type S TI
Personnel from Host Institution				
Sex desegregation services	9	63	25	22
Race desegregation services	14	50	43	NA
Personnel from the USOE Regional Offices				
Sex desegregation services	25	33	7	16
Race desegregation services	45	40	15	NA
State Board of Education				
Sex desegregation services	32	27	12	22
Race desegregation services	14	27	15	NA
School District Central Office Staff				
Sex desegregation services	53	55	38	44
Race desegregation services	84	55	64	NA

ments visited in our fieldwork, another unit of the State Department was undertaking sex desegregation work as well as the Title IV SEA unit.

The data in Table 12 also illustrate that the SEA experiences higher levels of participation from different agencies than do the GAC and Institutes. In general, GACs and TIs receive more participation from their client school districts, whereas the SEA receives more participation from its host institution, again illustrating the SEA's tie to the state hierarchy.

The *support* received by the Title IV project is another way of examining interaction patterns with outside agencies. It is interesting to note, though not surprising, that all projects report higher levels of support than participation, as the data in Table 13 illustrate. It is also not surprising that the GAC and Type D TI report higher levels of support for their race desegregation services than for their sex desegregation services, since race desegregation has been their area of emphasis for so long. It is somewhat more interesting that in the cases of the State Department of Education and the client school district central office staff, the SEA reports *just as much or slightly more* support for sex desegregation services as for race desegregation services. This tends to suggest that SEAs may have a predilection toward sex desegregation services. It further presents us with a possible explanation for the predilection: client demand. The SEA has responsibility for serving all districts within the state, unlike the GAC and TI. This wider base of client districts undoubtedly includes some districts with *no* race desegregation problems as well as some who are seeking to avoid desegregation. The GAC and TI are probably more likely to have as clients only those districts who have race desegre-

Table 13

PERCENT OF PROJECT DIRECTORS REPORTING *HIGH* LEVELS OF SUPPORT BY OUTSIDE AGENCIES IN PLANNING TITLE IV SERVICES

Type of Program	GAC	SEA	Type D TI	Type S TI
State Department of Education				
Sex desegregation services	36	80	50	56
Race desegregation services	61	78	64	NA
State Board of Education				
Sex desegregation services	17	49	25	56
Race desegregation services	21	40	36	NA
Personnel from the USOE Regional Offices				
Sex desegregation services	58	57	31	40
Race desegregation services	73	70	63	NA
School District Central Office Staff				
Sex desegregation services	67	70	60	84
Race desegregation services	84	71	57	NA

gation problems and are seeking solutions for them. As a result, the SEA response to the question of support is more likely to represent the average of all districts in a given state. The frequency can be taken to imply that school districts in 25 states (or 70 percent of the 36 SEAs responding) are just as supportive of sex desegregation activities as of race desegregation activities.

SUMMARY

In summary, it appears that the SEA is much more involved with external agencies than the other project types. It also appears that this high level of involvement is important for the way SEAs operate, both with their host institution and with other organizations. The GAC is much less involved with outside interactions, while both types of TIs are quite involved with their host institutions but more independent from other organizations. These interaction patterns do not have any consistent effect on project implementation problems or their effectiveness, however, nor do they lead to any particular activity pattern. To determine the activity pattern of the Title IV projects and the influences on these patterns, we turn now to an examination of the project offices themselves.

REFERENCES

1. *Barron's Profiles of American Colleges*, 9th ed., Barron's Educational Series, New York, 1974.
2. Kendall, M. G., *Rank Correlation Methods*, Griffin, London, 1948.

IV. COMPARATIVE DESCRIPTION OF PROGRAM OPERATIONS

In FY76, projects funded under Title IV of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 were given the opportunity to deliver assistance in remedying sex discrimination to school districts that requested such services along with the race desegregation assistance they were already offering. All of the Title IV GACs and SEAs now offer both types of assistance, as are 8 of the 14 Type D Institutes responding (57 percent). In this section we will attempt to draw profiles of the race and sex desegregation programs offered by these Title IV projects and, where relevant, we will examine the changes that have taken place in the activities undertaken by these projects since last year. The interaction of the projects with district personnel, and the changes that have occurred in these relationships, will also be examined.

RACE DESEGREGATION ACTIVITY PROFILES

Table 14 illustrates the race desegregation activities undertaken most frequently by GACs, SEAs, and Type D Institutes as reported by the directors of these projects. In general, GACs undertake the greatest variety of desegregation activities. Fifty-two percent of the activities listed are being undertaken frequently by over half of the responding GAC directors, as compared to 33 percent for the SEA and 38 percent for the Desegregation Institute. General Assistance Centers are more apt than other project types to establish needs assessment procedures, develop curricula, train personnel responsible for in-service in the districts, hold multidistrict workshops and workshops to sensitize administrators and school staffs to desegregation issues, and develop and disseminate materials on desegregation. From these responses, it appears that the GAC's desegregation program is generally geared to training, human relations work, and programmatic activities.[1]

The Desegregation Institute's profile is similar to the GAC's in that it also shows a preponderance of training and programmatic activities. Besides undertaking the training of personnel responsible for in-service in the districts and holding multidistrict workshops to the same extent as the GAC, Desegregation Institutes are more apt than other project types to develop new instructional and counseling techniques, train school personnel in the use of new methods, and help districts to establish evaluation techniques. Thus, the Desegregation Institute appears to focus on a total training program, including the development of the materials, the training itself, and assisting the district with evaluation and measurement techniques.

In contrast to both the GAC and the Desegregation Institute, the SEA's focus is on desegregation-specific activities and on providing technical assistance to school districts. State Education Agencies are more apt than other project types to help districts: locate minority personnel; develop new administrative techniques; train local directors of desegregation projects; hold workshops to sensitize pupil-

[1] Programmatic activities in this context are those that help districts to develop programs that will enhance their adaptation to desegregation.

Table 14

TITLE IV PROJECTS DESEGREGATION ACTIVITY PROFILE

Desegregation Activity Undertaken	Percent Responding "Most Frequently"		
	GAC	SEA	Type D TI
Establish needs assessment procedures	70	54	29
Help districts locate minority personnel	4	19	0
Develop new instructional techniques	88	56	100
Develop curricula	92	54	79
Develop new administrative techniques	38	46	36
Develop new counseling techniques	42	23	50
Train school personnel in use of new methods	83	46	100
Train personnel responsible for in-service	71	37	71
Train local directors of desegregation projects	17	19	8
Hold workshops to sensitize administrators	88	71	57
Hold workshops to sensitize school staffs	88	66	71
Hold workshops to sensitize pupil-contact personnel	42	43	21
Hold multidistrict workshops to facilitate sharing	50	40	50
Help districts establish evaluation techniques	13	21	31
Assist districts in developing desegregation plans	4	43	0
Help districts assess desegregation capabilities	13	35	8
Help districts cope with crises	38	49	29
Help districts understand their responsibilities under guidelines	75	86	0
Help districts write proposals	54	66	0
Conduct surveys	4	49	29
Develop and disseminate materials	58	49	39
Train trainers	(a)	(a)	79
Work with institute participants in district	(a)	(a)	86
Contact participants systematically	(a)	(a)	92
Observe administrators	(a)	(a)	29
Observe teachers	(a)	(a)	29

[a]Not asked of GAC and SEA project directors.

contact personnel; develop desegregation plans; assess desegregation capabilities; cope with crises; write proposals; understand their responsibilities concerning desegregation; and conduct surveys to obtain statistical information. Table 15 clarifies the distinction between the types of desegregation related programs offered by the three project types by showing the frequency with which each project type *more often* undertakes the activities within our activity categories than other project types. (See Sec. II for a discussion of the activities that make up these categories.)

We see from this table that GACs more frequently undertake *training* activities, SEAs more frequently undertake *desegregation* and *technical assistance* activities, and Desegregation Institutes more frequently undertake *programmatic* activities. These results are entirely consistent with the results from the previous review of Title IV operations. In fact, of the activities included in both years' questionnaires, 75 percent of the activities undertaken frequently by GACs and Desegregation Institutes in 1974-1975 are listed as being undertaken frequently by

Table 15

DESEGREGATION ACTIVITIES UNDERTAKEN MORE FREQUENTLY BY ONE PROJECT TYPE THAN ANOTHER, BY ACTIVITY CATEGORY[a]

Project Type	Percent of Activities Within Categories Undertaken More Frequently			
	Training	*Programmatic*	*Desegregation*	*Technical Assistance*
GAC	60	25	9	0
SEA	20	25	100	100
Type D TI	40	50	0	25

[a]In some cases project types were tied in the frequency with which their directors reported undertaking certain activities. Therefore, the column percentages may total to greater than 100 percent.

these project types in 1975-1976. The corresponding figure for the SEA is 71 percent. Thus, it appears that the race desegregation activity profile for these three project types has not changed substantially with the addition of sex desegregation responsibilities.

Tables 16 to 18 present data with which to examine the types of changes that have taken place in the race desegregation activity profiles of these three project types. They list activities common to both questionnaires and which are reported by project directors to have been undertaken to a greater or lesser extent this year than last year.[z] From Table 16 we see that in 1975-1976 GACs were more apt to undertake the following activities than they were in 1974-1975: (1) help districts understand their responsibilities under federal guidelines, (2) develop and disseminate desegregation materials to districts, and (3) develop curricula and new counseling techniques. The first two activities are correlated significantly with undertaking similar activities as part of their sex desegregation program (.607 and .574, respectively, both significant at the .01 level). These correlations suggest that the increase in the frequency with which GACs undertake these two activities is due in part to their undertaking similar activities for sex desegregation. The other two activities undertaken more frequently by GACs this year—developing curricula and developing new counseling techniques—are not correlated significantly with their counterparts in sex desegregation activities. This indicates that when GACs undertake these two activities as part of their race desegregation program, they do not necessarily undertake the same activities for their sex desegregation program. In fact, only 13 percent of the GACs frequently develop curricula as part of their sex desegregation program, as compared to 92 percent which do so as part of their race desegregation program. Twenty-two percent of the GACs report frequently developing new counseling techniques for sex desegregation, as compared to 42 percent which do so for race desegregation. It is not really surprising that GACs infrequently develop curricula and new counseling techniques as part of

[z] By 10 percent or more of the respondents.

Table 16

GAC RACE DESEGREGATION ACTIVITY PROFILE: 1975-1976/1974-1975
PROJECT YEAR COMPARISON

Race Desegregation Activity	Percent Responding "Most Frequently"		
	1975-1976	1974-1975	Difference
Undertaken More Frequently 1975-1976[a]			
Help districts understand responsibilities under guidelines	75	39	+36
Develop curricula	92	77	+15
Develop new counseling techniques	42	29	+13
Develop and disseminate materials	58	46	+12
Undertaken More Frequently 1974-1975[a]			
Develop new administrative procedures	38	63	-25
Train local directors of desegregation projects	17	35	-18
Help districts establish evaluation techniques	13	27	-14
Assist districts in developing desegregation plans	4	18	-14

[a] ≥, ≤ 10 percent difference.

Table 17

SEA RACE DESEGREGATION ACTIVITY PROFILE: 1975-1976/1974-1975
PROJECT YEAR COMPARISON

Race Desegregation Activity	Percent Responding "Most Frequently"		
	1975-1976	1974-1975	Difference
Undertaken Most Frequently 1975-1976[a]			
Help districts understand responsibilities under guidelines	86	65	+21
Undertaken Most Frequently 1974-1975[a]			
Train school personnel in use of new methods	46	67	-21
Help districts locate qualified minority personnel	19	32	-13
Help districts write proposals	66	76	-10

[a] ≥, ≤ 10 percent difference.

Table 18

DESEGREGATION INSTITUTE ACTIVITY PROFILE: 1975-1976/1974-1975
PROJECT YEAR COMPARISON

Race Desegregation Activity	Percent Responding "Most Frequently"		
	1975-1976	1974-1975	Difference
Undertaken Most Frequently 1975-1976[a]			
Develop new instructional techniques	100	80	+20
Develop curricula	79	63	+16
Help districts cope with crises	29	13	+16
Train school personnel in use of new methods	100	85	+15
Develop new administrative techniques	36	26	+10
Undertaken Most Frequently 1974-1975[a]			
Hold workshops for pupil-contact personnel	21	71	-50
Locate minority personnel	0	14	-14

[a] $\geq, \leq$ 10 percent difference.

their sex desegregation program, since neither of these activities is required initially of districts attempting to comply with Title IX.

As Table 16 indicates, the activities that GACs more frequently report undertaking *less* of this year than last year are: developing new administrative procedures, training local directors of desegregation projects, helping districts to establish evaluation techniques, and assisting districts in developing desegregation plans. None of these activities are being undertaken frequently by a majority of the GACs, although last year 63 percent indicated that they frequently developed new administrative procedures. Developing new administrative procedures less often is associated with devoting more director and staff time to sex desegregation and working with a greater proportion of new districts, however. This suggests that the reduction in offering this activity is associated with GACs' offering a sex desegregation program, although the relationships were not statistically significant.

Turning to the SEAs, we see from Table 17 that they are more apt to help districts understand their responsibilities under desegregation guidelines this year than they were last year. Unlike GACs, this activity is not significantly associated with SEAs' undertaking the related sex desegregation activity, even though 94 percent of the SEA directors report frequently helping districts to understand their responsibilities under Title IX. This lack of association suggests that for SEAs, helping districts to understand their race desegregation responsibilities is distinctly separate from helping districts to understand their Title IX responsibilities.

Looking further at the data in Table 17, we see that SEAs are less apt this year to train school personnel in the use of new methods, help districts locate qualified minority personnel, or help districts write proposals to obtain desegregation funds. We are unable to determine why SEAs changed their program in this manner; however, a reduction in the frequency with which these activities are undertaken was not associated with any changes in project office characteristics, the number

of districts served, or the extent to which their program is devoted to sex desegregation assistance.

We are also unable to satisfactorily explain the changes that have occurred in the race desegregation program offered by the Type D Institutes (see Table 18). Two activities—developing new instructional techniques and training school personnel in the use of new methods—were undertaken by nearly all of the TIs last year and are being undertaken by all the responding Desegregation Institutes this year. A third activity—developing curricula—was also considered to be a typical activity for an Institute to undertake last year and continues to be an important activity for them this year. However, this year a greater proportion of Desegregation Institutes are undertaking two activities not typically undertaken by Institutes last year—helping districts cope with crises and developing new administrative procedures.

Two factors militate against our ability to draw inferences or describe the significance of relationships for the TI activity profiles. The first of these is turnover. Last year there were 44 Type D TIs, several of which had been funded for a number of years. This year there were only 17 Type D TIs, several of which were new, and our data are based on responses from only 8 of the 17. Second, this year's fieldwork did not include visits to any TIs, which makes it even more difficult to speculate about how the Type D TIs have changed their activities as a result of the additional responsibility of assisting in sex desegregation efforts. Within these constraints, we will propose differences that appear significant.

The data imply that the larger the proportion of time and effort a Desegregation Institute spends on sex desegregation, the more apt it is to frequently develop new administrative procedures (strong, positive correlations although not statistically significant). In addition, newly funded Desegregation Institutes were more apt to frequently develop new administrative procedures than were Institutes that had been funded for more than one year ($-.536$, significant at the .05 level). Although these data are certainly not conclusive, they tend to suggest that Desegregation Institutes are working more with the administrative level of district personnel than they were prior to the addition of sex desegregation responsibilities. This is reasonable, given the heavy emphasis of Title IX regulations on administrative or policymaking changes. The possibility that Desegregation Institutes are working this year with different levels of district personnel than last year is also supported by the fact that the activity showing the greatest decline in frequency is "holding workshops for pupil-contact personnel." Fifty percent *fewer* Desegregation Institute directors reported frequently undertaking this activity than last year (see Table 18). In turn, this activity is associated positively with its counterpart in sex desegregation activities (.596). However, none of the Desegregation Institutes reported frequently holding workshops for pupil-contact personnel to sensitize them to sex desegregation issues, which might account for why this race desegregation activity is being undertaken so much less frequently this year than last year.

In summary, we see that GACs are frequently undertaking more race desegregation activities than are SEAs and Type D TIs. Their program has not changed substantially, but where changes have occurred they are associated with GACs offering sex desegregation services. As was determined in last year's study, the GAC's race desegregation program primarily consists of training, programmatic, and human relations activities.

The race desegregation activity profile for the Type D TIs looks very similar to that of the GACs in that they too show a preponderance of programmatic and training activities. Like the GACs, Type D TIs show only a few changes in the activities undertaken this year compared to last year, and while these changes appear to be somewhat related to the sex desegregation program now being offered by them, these relationships are not as strong as in the case of the GACs. (It is very possible, however, that these weaker relationships are the result of a much smaller sample of Type D TIs (8) as compared to GACs (24).)

On the other hand, SEAs are often found to be undertaking fewer race desegregation activities than either GACs or Type D TIs, as well as different types of activities. State Education Agencies more frequently undertake *desegregation* and *technical assistance* activities. Their program has also changed very little from last year, but unlike the GACs and Type D TIs the changes that have occurred show no relationship to the sex desegregation activities they are offering. So far, our examination of the race desegregation activity profiles of GACs, SEAs, and Type D TIs seems to suggest that for GACs and Type D TIs, sex desegregation assistance is tied into their race desegregation assistance, whereas for SEAs there is a greater tendency to keep these two types of assistance distinct. In the next section we examine the sex desegregation activity profiles for the four Title IV project types.

SEX DESEGREGATION ACTIVITY PROFILES

Table 19 illustrates the sex desegregation activities undertaken most frequently by all four Title IV project types. As expected, the Type S Training Institutes more frequently undertake a greater number of the sex desegregation activities than do any of the other project types. Seventy-eight percent of the activities listed are being undertaken frequently by over half of the responding Type S Institutes. The SEAs are the next most likely to be undertaking sex desegregation activities. Sixty-seven percent of the activities are being undertaken frequently by one-half of the SEA projects. General Assistance Centers and Type D Institutes are undertaking sex desegregation activities less frequently. Only 39 percent and 33 percent of the activities listed are being undertaken frequently by the GAC projects and Type D Institutes, respectively.

Looking at specific sex desegregation activities, we see that GACs are primarily undertaking sex desegregation activities that concentrate on information dissemination. They frequently help districts to understand their responsibilities under Title IX (91 percent), and disseminate materials on sex discrimination (87 percent), as well as sensitize school administrators (83 percent), and hold multidistrict workshops to facilitate the sharing of information among districts (74 percent). As we noted earlier, frequently undertaking these kinds of activities as part of their sex desegregation program has resulted in GACs' undertaking these same types of activities more frequently in the race desegregation portion of their program. General Assistance Centers are the least likely project type to undertake sex desegregation activities, which may require a greater commitment of personnel and other resources, such as developing techniques for facilitating community acceptance (0 percent), helping districts to locate personnel with coeducational experience (4 percent), and developing curricula (13 percent). Thus, it appears that al-

Table 19

TITLE IV PROJECTS SEX DESEGREGATION ACTIVITY PROFILE

Sex Desegregation Activities Undertaken	Percent Responding "Most Frequently"			
	GAC	SEA	Type D TI[a]	Type S TI
Develop procedures to insure students equal access to courses	33	66	43	67
Develop procedures to identify sex-stereotyped textbooks	42	26	63	56
Develop curricula	13	20	63	22
Help assess sex desegregation needs	67	83	43	67
Help districts identify sexist policies	50	63	63	67
Devise procedures to eliminate sex discrimination in staffing	38	63	25	67
Help districts locate qualified coed personnel	4	3	0	34
Develop procedures to insure students equal access to athletics	25	68	13	67
Develop procedures to insure students equal access to extracurricular activities	29	51	29	67
Provide counselors with new techniques	22	78	43	56
Sensitize counselors	30	24	43	56
Sensitize school administrators	83	86	57	89
Develop techniques to facilitate community acceptance	0	6	0	37
Hold multidistrict workshops to facilitate sharing	74	69	43	33
Develop a Title IX plan for districts	35	71	29	67
Help districts understand Title IX responsibilities	91	94	33	89
Disseminate materials on sex discrimination	87	77	72	78
Maintain libraries	55	43	72	78
Train school personnel to serve as trainers	(b)	(b)	(b)	67
Work with trainers in their districts	(b)	(b)	(b)	56
Contact participants systematically	(b)	(b)	(b)	56
Observe administrators	(b)	(b)	(b)	0
Observe teachers	(b)	(b)	(b)	11

[a]Eight of the 14 Type D Training Institutes responding (57 percent) are undertaking sex desegregation activities.

[b]Not asked of GAC, SEA, and Type D TI project directors.

though GACs are offering sex desegregation assistance, it is more general in nature. General Assistance Centers appear to have retained their race desegregation thrust, although their race desegregation program has been affected somewhat by the addition of the sex desegregation component.

The Type D Institutes also still focus primarily on race desegregation, undertaking the following sex desegregation activities most frequently: disseminating materials on sex discrimination (72 percent), maintaining libraries (72 percent), developing procedures to identify sex-stereotyped textbooks (63 percent), developing curricula (63 percent), and helping districts identify sexist policies (63 percent). While the two activities undertaken most frequently are rather general in nature, the other three activities can be thought of as programmatic in nature and therefore somewhat typical for an Institute. Furthermore, the data in Table 20 indicate

that the Desegregation Institute's sex desegregation program is closely tied into its race desegregation program.

All of the Type D Institutes undertaking sex desegregation assistance report that they piggyback these activities onto their race desegregation activities and work with the same districts and personnel during both activities. They are less likely to use staff members from last year to deliver their sex desegregation assistance than either the GAC or SEA; however, as we shall see below, this reflects a higher turnover in personnel from one year to the next. The SEAs show the least propensity to piggyback their sex desegregation work onto their race desegregation work, both in terms of activities and in terms of districts and participants with whom they work. Since an SEA's program is often geared to short-term or emergency issues, it stands to reason that there would be less overlap between their race and sex desegregation work.

Table 20

EXTENT TO WHICH PROJECT IS ABLE TO PIGGYBACK SEX DESEGREGATION ASSISTANCE ONTO RACE DESEGREGATION PROGRAM, BY PROJECT TYPE

Method of Piggybacking	Percent Responding "Frequently" or "Almost Always"		
	GAC	SEA	Type D TI
Piggyback sex desegregdtion activities onto race desegregation activities	87	61	100
Utilize staff members from last year for sex desegregation work	82	86	71
Interact with same district personnel for both types of desegregation work	92	75	100
Work with same districts for both types of desegregation work	92	80	100

Returning to the data in Table 19, we see that SEAs are most likely to help districts understand their responsibilities under Title IX (94 percent), sensitize school administrators (86 percent), develop procedures to help districts assess their sex desegregation needs (83 percent), provide counselors with new techniques (78 percent), and disseminate materials on sex discrimination (77 percent). While several of these activities are general in nature, others reflect a pattern typical of an SEA both in terms of *type of activity*, such as technical assistance (needs assessment), and *level of personnel* dealt with (administrators). However, their sex desegregation program does show a marked deviation from their race desegregation program in that they report frequently providing counselors with new techniques. Only 23 percent of the SEA directors reported frequently undertaking this activity as part of their race desegregation program; in contrast to the 78 percent who report frequently undertaking this activity as part of their sex desegregation program. In addition, there was virtually no change in the percentage of SEAs under-

taking this activity as part of their race desegregation program this year as compared to last year, underscoring the fact that for SEAs, their sex desegregation program is not influencing their race desegregation program to any great extent.

Type S Institutes are frequently undertaking most of the sex desegregation activities on the list, as we might expect, given that their sole focus is on eliminating sex discrimination. Therefore, it is more revealing to examine the activities that Type S Institute directors indicate as being undertaken *least* frequently. Type S Institutes least frequently observe administrators (0 percent) and teachers (11 percent), and develop curricula (22 percent). All the other activities listed were undertaken frequently by at least one-third of the Type S Institutes. In our study of program operations last year we also found that very few Desegregation Institutes observed teachers and administrators as part of their ongoing program, a fact which is not too surprising, since this type of evaluation is generally costly to undertake and can provoke anxiety in those being observed. However, Type S Institutes are also infrequently developing curricula, an activity which we have come to consider typical for an Institute to undertake.

To more fully understand the activity profile of the Type S Institutes, we grouped these sex desegregation activities into two categories, by stages of compliance with Title IX. (For a complete discussion of these activity categories, see Sec. II.) Type S Institutes are much more likely to be undertaking *Stage 1* sex desegregation activities than they are *Stage 2* activities. Fully two-thirds of the Type S Institute directors reported frequently undertaking each of the six *Stage 1* activities, whereas the percentage of directors reporting frequently undertaking the four *Stage 2* activities ranged from 22 to 56. Table 21 illustrates this from a different perspective. From the data in the table, we see that the *Stage 1* activities are undertaken more frequently by Type S Institutes than by any other project type 67 percent of the time, whereas they undertake *Stage 2* activities more frequently than other project types only 25 percent of the time. These data seem to indicate that as a new institution, Type S Institutes are focusing primarily on the activities they know will be of the most immediate benefit to the districts they serve. This

Table 21

SEX DESEGREGATION ACTIVITIES UNDERTAKEN MORE FREQUENTLY BY ONE PROJECT TYPE THAN ANOTHER, BY ACTIVITY CATEGORY

Project Type	Percent of Activities Within Categories Undertaken More Frequently	
	Stage 1	*Stage 2*
GAC	0	0
SEA	33	25
Type D TI	0	50
Type S TI	67	25

may, in fact, be their method of "institution building" or gaining the trust of their districts as a viable service agency. The Type D Institutes, on the other hand, undertake *Stage 2* activities more frequently than other project types 50 percent of the time, even though we saw earlier that in general they frequently undertake fewer sex desegregation activities than any of the other project types. However, we also noted earlier that Type D Institutes undertake their sex desegregation work in the same districts and with the same personnel as their race desegregation work. They already have an entrée into these districts on the basis of their race desegregation work. Also, in all probability, Type D Institutes will undertake those sex desegregation activities that can be piggybacked onto their race desegregation activities, regardless of the district's stage of compliance with respect to Title IX. Furthermore, these activities tend to be second-stage activities rather than first-stage activities, which are more specific to Title IX and less easily piggybacked.

The data in Table 21 also confirm our earlier finding that sex desegregation assistance is not a primary focus for the GACs and that they undertake sex desegregation assistance much less frequently than either the SEAs or Type S Institutes. Table 22 further substantiates this. We asked project directors to specify the proportion of their time, their staff's time, the project's budget, and the project's activities that were devoted to sex desegregation. This was, of course, not asked of Type S Institutes, since their entire program is devoted to sex desegregation. We did not really expect any of the remaining three project types to report spending more than 50 percent of their time on sex desegregation work: Devoting a larger percentage of their efforts to sex desegregation might be construed as neglecting the original purpose for which they were funded—that of providing race desegregation assistance. Therefore, we considered the range of realistic responses to be from zero to 50 percent. We see from Table 22 that the GACs report the smallest percentage of project resources being devoted to sex desegregation work. State Education Agencies and Type D Institutes appear to be devoting quite a bit of their resources to sex desegregation work, given that we feel the top of the range to be 50 percent. It is especially surprising that the Type D Institutes report such a large amount of project resources being devoted to sex desegregation, since they are not undertaking sex desegregation work nearly to the same extent as are the SEAs. However,

Table 22

AMOUNT OF PROJECT RESOURCES SPENT ON SEX DESEGREGATION ACTIVITIES, BY PROJECT TYPE

Project Resources	Percent Spent on Sex Desegregation Work		
	GAC	SEA	Type D TI
Director's time	26	42	38
Staff time	28	38	39
Budget	26	33	42
Activities	26	43	40

it is quite possible that the type of activities undertaken by Type D Institutes are more costly than those undertaken by SEAs, or that it is very difficult for the Type D Institutes to estimate the proportion of their project resources being spent on sex desegregation work. As we saw from Table 20, the race and sex desegregation programs of the Type D Institutes are inextricably tied together, and they might be less able than the SEAs to separate out their two services. As a result, these figures could be inflated for the Type D Institutes; they might realistically fall somewhere between the figures for the GAC and the SEA.

So far we have seen that there is a difference in the extent to which GACs, SEAs, and Type D Institutes are undertaking sex desegregation work. In one sense we could have predicted this from our knowledge of the project types based on last year's work. Of all the project types, GACs were the most likely to have developed a long-range, well-defined race desegregation program. Therefore, substantial additions to their program responsibilities could easily be disruptive. It is not too surprising, then, that first the sex desegregation activities undertaken most frequently by GACs are of a general nature, not requiring a great amount of project resources; and second that GACs have retained race desegregation as their primary focus. State Education Agencies, on the other hand, were less likely than GACs to have a well-defined program for race desegregation assistance and were more likely to undertake short-term technical assistance types of activities. In a sense adding sex desegregation responsibilities to their Title IV race desegregation work was a natural for SEAs. First, since their race desegregation program was geared mainly to short-term or emergency issues, adding activities would not be as disruptive. Second, SEAs frequently targeted their race desegregation assistance to district administrators—the same personnel level to which sex desegregation activities are frequently directed. Third, the type of requests from school districts for assistance in helping them comply with Title IX requirements is likely to be of a technical assistance nature. Thus, we expected SEAs to undertake sex desegregation activities to a greater extent than GACs and these expectations were confirmed by the data.

The sex desegregation profile of the Type D Institutes conformed to our expectations as well. First, we expected the Desegregation Institutes to be the least likely to frequently undertake sex desegregation activities given the existence of Type S Institutes. Second, since we knew that Desegregation Institutes worked closely with a small number of districts, planning programs to meet the specific needs of those districts, we expected any sex desegregation activities undertaken by Type D Institutes to be undertaken in the same districts, and then only if they meshed with the race desegregation program already being offered.

INFLUENCES ON ACTIVITY PROFILES

From last year's study, we know that the programs offered by the Title IV projects are influenced partly by the amount of support projects perceived for a particular program. This year we wanted to test this association in terms of the support projects perceived for race and sex desegregation services. We asked the GAC, SEA, and Desegregation Institute project directors whether various groups were more supportive of race desegregation than sex desegregation, more suppor-

tive of sex desegregation than race desegregation, or whether they supported both equally. For the most part, the project directors felt that people supported both race desegregation and sex desegregation equally. However, as the data in Table 23 illustrate, when there was a clear indication of support for one over the other, both GACs and Type D Institutes perceived the support to be for race desegregation, whereas the SEAs perceived the support to be for sex desegregation. The bottom portion of this table breaks out three of these groups separately—project staff, host institution, and the USOE regional program officer. It is interesting to note that while the GACs basically perceive these three groups as supporting both types of programs equally, when a preference is perceived it is more frequently in the direction of race desegregation. The same is true for the SEAs with one exception: One-third of the SEAs perceive their State Department to be more supportive of sex desegregation, compared to 25 percent who perceive their State Department to be more supportive of race desegregation. In the case of the Type D Institutes, the majority perceive their host institution as more supportive of race desegregation and the rest perceive their host institution as supporting both equally. In fact, the only group that is perceived by any of the Desegregation Institute directors as being more supportive of sex desegregation is their project staff, for which 13 percent of the directors saw their staff as more supportive of sex desegregation than race desegregation.

Table 23

PERCEIVED SUPPORT OF VARIOUS INTERNAL AND EXTERNAL GROUPS FOR RACE DESEGREGATION VERSUS SEX DESEGREGATION ASSISTANCE, BY PROJECT TYPE[a]

Internal and External Groups	Amount of Perceived Support by Project Types		
	GAC	SEA	Type D TI
All Groups			
# of groups listed as more supportive of sex desegregation	0	6	0
# of groups listed as more supportive of race desegregation	3	0	6
Project Staff			
% more supportive of sex desegregation	0	3	13
% more supportive of race desegregation	33	30	13
% support both equally	67	67	75
Host Institution			
% more supportive of sex desegregation	13	33	0
% more supportive of race desegregation	17	25	57
% support both equally	71	42	43
USOE Regional Program Officer			
% more supportive of sex desegregation	8	3	0
% more supportive of race desegregation	17	37	14
% support both equally	75	60	86

Table 24 illustrates the relationship between this perceived differential support for race desegregation versus sex desegregation and the amount of resources devoted by these projects to sex desegregation work. First, as would be expected, when the project offices perceive greater support for race desegregation than sex desegregation, they devote fewer resources to sex desegregation work (coefficients are negative). (The exception to this is in the case of the Type D Institutes—the more supportive they perceive their USOE regional program officer to be toward race desegregation, the *more* resources they devote to sex desegregation work. However, we had noted above that it is likely that the Desegregation Institutes had difficulty accurately estimating the proportion of their resources being devoted to sex desegregation given that their race desegregation and sex desegregation work are closely tied together. In addition, these statistics are based on a fairly small sample size for the Desegregation Institutes, making them more volatile.) It is interesting to note that even though we found the State Department to have a great deal of influence over the program of an SEA in last year's study, these data indicate that even when the State Department is perceived as more supportive of race desegregation, the SEAs do not correspondingly devote fewer resources to their sex desegregation work. This suggests that there are other incentives operating that incline an SEA to undertake sex desegregation work. For example, districts may request sex desegregation assistance from SEAs more frequently than race desegregation assistance and for a number of different reasons: Districts may perceive sex desegregation as less threatening; they may feel that SEAs are more qualified to deliver assistance with sex desegregation; or they may feel a greater need for sex desegregation than for race desegregation assistance. (The impact of district-level support on program operations will be discussed in Sec. V.) Alternatively, sex desegregation activities may be easier for an SEA to undertake than race desegregation activities and the SEAs may simply be following the path of least resistance. This possibility is further supported by noting from the data in Table 24 that the predisposition of the SEA project staff toward race desegregation rather than sex desegregation is more highly correlated with their devoting fewer

Table 24

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SUPPORT FOR RACE DESEGREGATION VERSUS SEX DESEGREGATION ASSISTANCE AND PERCENT OF PROJECT RESOURCES SPENT ON SEX DESEGREGATION, BY PROJECT TYPE

Project Resources Spent on Sex Desegregation Work	Greater Support for Race Desegregation than Sex Desegregation Work								
	Project Staff			Host Institution			USOE Regional Program Officer		
	GAC	SEA	Type D TI	GAC	SEA	Type D TI	GAC	SEA	Type D TI
% of director's time	-.189	-.337[a]	-.444	-.329[a]	-.073	-.160	-.159	-.109	.408
% of staff time	-.219	-.196	-.240	-.250	-.029	.000	-.176	-.153	.320
% of budget	-.054	-.226	-.480	-.224	.013	-.160	.054	-.214	.408
% of activities	.011	-.328[a]	-.240	-.332[a]	-.110	.000	-.100	-.058	.320

[a]Significant at the .05 level.

resources to sex desegregation than any of the other variables. On the other hand, these data suggest that GACs are the most strongly influenced by the predisposition of their host institutions to race desegregation over sex desegregation. This is not too surprising: Last year we found that when the GAC was closely tied to its host institution it tended to undertake desegregation activities less often and training activities more often, since the latter could be considered less controversial for a university affiliate to undertake. It follows, then, that when a university is *perceived* as sanctioning race desegregation work, the GAC will opt to undertake that kind of assistance to an even greater extent than if the university was not considered to be so disposed.

Table 25 shows the relationship between the amount of project resources devoted to sex desegregation work and the frequency with which the projects undertake the activities in our categories. These data illustrate some very important relationships. First, in all cases, as the GAC devotes more of its project resources to sex desegregation work, it undertakes more of the sex desegregation activities and less of the race desegregation activities. Second, in all cases, as the SEA devotes more of its project resources to sex desegregation work, it undertakes less *Stage 1* activities and more *Stage 2* activities. Although these relationships are certainly not strong, they are consistent and do suggest that either *Stage 2* activities require greater amounts of project resources, or that SEAs first undertake *Stage 1* activities and then undertake *Stage 2* activities if their resources permit. As in the case of the GACs, devoting more of their project resources to sex desegregation work is associated with SEAs undertaking race desegregation activities less often. The data for the Type D Institutes show yet a third pattern. Devoting greater amounts of project resources to their sex desegregation work is not only associated with the

Table 25

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN FREQUENTLY UNDERTAKING CERTAIN KINDS OF RACE AND SEX DESEGREGATION ACTIVITIES AND AMOUNT OF PROJECT RESOURCES SPENT ON SEX DESEGREGATION WORK, BY PROJECT TYPE

	Percent of Project Resources Spent on Sex Desegregation Work											
	Director's Time			Staff Time			Budget			Activities		
Activity Category	GAC	SEA	Type D TI	GAC	SEA	Type D TI	GAC	SEA	Type D TI	GAC	SEA	Type D TI
Sex Desegregation Activity												
Stage 1	.099	-.198	.707	.211	-.153	.960	.397	-.138	1.000	.180	-.084	.960
Stage 2	.227	.112	.250	.208	.396[a]	.320	.301	.364[b]	.167	.175	.192	.320
Race Desegregation Activity												
Training	-.262	-.025	.111	-.073	-.088	.267	-.079	-.209	.160	-.143	-.073	.267
Programmatic	-.234	-.043	.222	-.416[b]	.003	.756	-.254	-.077	.480	-.255	-.056	.756
Desegregation	-.291	-.262	-.632	-.293	.257	-.640[b]	-.356	-.080	-.612	-.217	-.106	-.640[b]
Technical assistance	-.240	-.241	-.333	-.181	-.017	-.143	.037	-.094	-.320	-.115	-.139	-.143

[a]Significant at the .01 level.

[b]Significant at the .05 level.

Desegregation Institutes' undertaking sex desegregation activities more often, but it is also associated with their undertaking race desegregation *training* and *programmatic* activities more often. Again, this is an indication that the Type D Institutes piggyback their sex desegregation activities onto the race desegregation activities they undertake most frequently—namely, *training* and *programmatic* assistance. However, when this occurs the Type D Institutes undertake race *desegregation* activities significantly less often and race desegregation *technical assistance* less often. Thus, while devoting greater amounts of project resources to sex desegregation work is *not* associated with the Desegregation Institutes' universally undertaking less race desegregation work, it is associated with their undertaking fewer of the race desegregation activities not commonly undertaken by them, namely, *technical assistance* and *desegregation* types of activities.

In summary, we have seen that GACs still predominantly focus on race desegregation assistance. The sex desegregation assistance that is undertaken frequently by a GAC is generally along the lines of information dissemination and can be undertaken without committing so many project resources that their race desegregation program is disrupted. General Assistance Centers that devote more of their resources to sex desegregation work undertake fewer race desegregation activities.

State Education Agencies, on the other hand, are undertaking sex desegregation work quite extensively. They do not appear to be merely tacking these activities onto their already existing race desegregation activities; rather, they appear to be keeping their two programs separate. Like the GAC, as more of their project resources are devoted to sex desegregation work, they undertake less race desegregation work.

In general, the Type D Institutes are not undertaking sex desegregation activities to any great extent. When they are, they are extensively piggybacking their sex desegregation activities onto their existing program, both in terms of the districts and personnel worked with and in terms of the activities undertaken, namely, *training* and *programmatic* assistance. When greater project resources are devoted to sex desegregation work, Desegregation Institutes do appear to be hindered from undertaking *desegregation* specific types of activities more frequently, however.

Quite naturally, Type S Institutes are undertaking sex desegregation assistance to a greater extent than are the other three project types. However, they appear to focus more on *Stage 1* activities than on *Stage 2* activities—an indication that they may be in the process of trying to build support among the districts for their services.

Thus, we see that in the case of the GAC, SEA, and Type D TI, there does appear to be a tradeoff between offering sex desegregation and race desegregation assistance, with certain types of race desegregation assistance being offered less frequently the more involved the project is in offering sex desegregation assistance. We will now examine the extent to which the Title IV project offices' service delivery pattern has changed as a result of adding sex desegregation responsibilities.

INTERACTION WITH DISTRICT PERSONNEL IN DELIVERING SERVICES

As can be seen from the data in Table 26, GACs and SEAs direct both their race

and sex desegregation activities more frequently to district superintendents and central office staff than do the Institutes. The Type S Institutes direct their activities most frequently to principals, which is consistent with their undertaking *Stage 1* activities to a great extent. (The *Stage 1* activity category includes efforts to ensure students equal access to courses, athletics, and extracurricular activities.) Type D Institutes mainly direct their sex desegregation activities to teachers and counselors, which is consistent with their piggybacking sex desegregation activities onto the *training* and *programmatic* types of assistance they undertake as part of their race desegregation programs. It is interesting to note, however, that fewer Type D Institute directors report directing their sex desegregation activities to principals than Type S Institute directors, especially since they do piggyback race and sex desegregation activities extensively and do report a higher frequency of directing their race desegregation activities to principals. Again, this can be partly explained by the types of sex desegregation activities undertaken by the Type D Institutes. While the Type S Institutes are more apt to undertake *Stage 1* activities, Type D Institutes are more apt to undertake *Stage 2* activities. *Stage 2* sex desegregation activities do not deal with the mechanics of pupil placement but rather with textbooks, curricula, and counseling techniques—issues that are less likely to directly involve principals.

Table 26

EXTENT TO WHICH RACE AND SEX DESEGREGATION ACTIVITIES ARE DIRECTED TO VARIOUS GROUPS, BY PROJECT TYPE

Activity Directed to	Percent Responding "Frequently" or "Almost Always"							
	GAC		SEA		Type D TI		Type S TI	
	Sex	Race	Sex	Race	Sex	Race	Sex	Race
District superintendents and central office staff	85	88	83	89	50	50	71	NA
Principals	86	96	80	89	63	79	100	NA
Teachers	74	96	69	75	99	86	78	NA
Counselors	68	79	66	61	88	79	89	NA

It is also interesting to note that unlike our finding from the previous report—namely, that SEAs tend primarily to work only with the administrative level of the district—this year SEAs tend to be working more extensively with all levels. This change can be seen more clearly by examining the data in Table 27, which shows the changes in the reported frequency with which GACs, SEAs, and Type D Institutes are directing their race desegregation activities to various levels of district personnel this year as compared to last year. We see that an additional 22 percent of SEA directors report frequently directing their race desegregation activities this year to counselors and principals. In fact, all three project types have substantially increased the frequency with which they direct their activities to counselors. It is also interesting to note that as we suggested above, Type D Institutes have shifted somewhat in terms of the level of personnel with whom they work; there is a

greater tendency for them to work with the administrative level of a district this year than there was last year and slightly less of a tendency for them to direct their activities to teachers. Thus, we see in the case of all three project types that there is a greater tendency to work with all levels of the district this year as opposed to last year. We are unable to determine, however, whether this change is the result of the addition of sex desegregation responsibilities to their prior desegregation work or whether it is the result of a change in focus brought about by the districts' perceiving different needs this year as compared to last year.

Table 27

CHANGES IN EXTENT TO WHICH RACE DESEGREGATION ACTIVITIES ARE DIRECTED TO CERTAIN GROUPS, BY PROJECT TYPE

Race Desegregation Activity Directed to:	Percent Changes in Responses (1974-1975 to 1975-1976)		
	GAC	SEA	Type D TI
District superintendent	0	0	+11
Principals	+13	+22	-4
Teachers	+4	+4	-9
Counselors	+16	+22	+20

V. PROJECT OFFICE CHARACTERISTICS

We turn now to an examination of the project offices themselves. In this section we will compare the staffing and organizational characteristics of the four project types and relate these characteristics to the extent to which the various project types are undertaking work related to eliminating sex discrimination.

PROJECT DIRECTOR DEMOGRAPHICS

Table 28 displays the characteristics of the directors of the four project types. We see that GAC directors are primarily white males with a mean age of 45. One-third are new to their positions this year. Generally, they came to their positions as Title IV directors from other positions at the college or university at which their Center is located or from positions in a school district. In fact, nearly all of the GAC directors report having prior school district experience. The GAC directors are the least likely of all project directors to have professional duties other than Title IV. For those who do, these duties are primarily teaching at a university (50 percent), working on other special projects (40 percent), or serving as consultants to other districts or projects (10 percent).

By way of contrast, 55 percent of the SEA directors are minority and 19 percent are female. They have the same mean age as do the GAC directors (45) and fewer of them are new to their positions this year. Their most recent positions were most likely in a school district, or, second, as Title IV staff members or in the State Department. Approximately two-thirds of the SEA directors report having professional duties in addition to Title IV, and of these, 86 percent report working on other special projects.

Table 28

PROJECT DIRECTOR CHARACTERISTICS

Characteristic	Project Type			
	GAC	SEA	Type D TI	Type S TI
Percent minority	37	55	57	22
Percent female	4	19	14	100
Mean age	45	45	37	36
Most recent prior job				
Title IV project staff	17	19	0	11
Host institution	33	19	71	22
Other college or university	4	11	7	33
Position in school district	21	22	0	11
Percent having other duties	42	64	64	100
Percent with prior school district experience	92	75	93	78
New project director (percent)	33	25	50	100

The same proportion of Type D Institute directors as SEA directors report having professional duties other than Title IV, but 78 percent report these duties to be teaching at a college or university. Type D Institute directors also evidence a different recruitment pattern than directors of GACs and SEAs: 71 percent came to the TI from other positions at their host institutions. Fifty-seven percent of the Type D Institute directors are minority with a mean age of 37; 14 percent are female. Not unexpectedly, all of the Type S Institute directors are female. They also have the lowest mean age (36) and the lowest percentage of minorities (22 percent). They are much less likely than Type D Institute directors to have come to their positions from other positions at the host institutions (22 percent as compared to 71 percent), an indication that the field of sex desegregation as an academic specialty may be new to these institutions. Although all of the Type S Institute directors report having professional duties in addition to Title IV, they are much less likely than Type D directors to be teaching at a university (44 percent as compared to 78 percent). This reinforces our assumption that sex desegregation work represents a new and unfamiliar area to many of these institutions and further suggests that the Type S Institutes may not be experiencing as close a working relationship to their host institutions as do the Desegregation Institutes.

BASIC PROJECT DEMOGRAPHICS

Table 29 displays additional demographic information for the four project types. We see that GACs continue to have the largest staffs and that over one-half of their staff members are white and male. General Assistance Centers are also the least likely of any of the project types to experience staff turnover from one year to the next. In contrast, the SEA has an average of four fewer full-time staff members than the GAC, even though the average number of districts served by SEAs is 45 more than for GACs. State Education Agencies lose a greater proportion of their staff members from year to year than do GACs, but they also have a higher percentage of female and minority staff members. It is quite possible that SEAs

Table 29

PROJECT OFFICE DEMOGRAPHICS

Project Office Characteristic	Project Type			
	GAC	SEA	Type D TI	Type S TI
Number of full-time staff (mean)	8	4	2	2
Number of part-time staff (mean)	3	4	5	6
Number of total staff (mean)	9	5	5	4
Percent female staff	45	50	60	80
Percent minority staff	46	59	64	44
Percent newly hired staff	44	60	100	100
Percent newly funded projects	17	11	50	100
Mean number of districts served	86	131	6	6

serve as a means of entry into the State Departments of Education for minority and female professionals, who can then move from the SEA to other spots within the state bureaucracy.

The Institutes have a completely different organizational perspective than the GACs and SEAs. First, they work with far fewer districts. Second, although the average size of their total staff is similar to that of the SEA, the majority of the Institute staff members work only part-time. Type S Institutes are all newly funded this year and, not surprisingly, they report the largest percentage of female staff members. Two-thirds of the Type D Institutes were funded previously, although all of the Type D Institutes report that their entire staff was newly hired this year. The inability of ongoing Type D Institutes to retain their staff members from the previous year is probably due in large part to the uncertainty they face in funding from year to year. In fact, 86 percent of the Type D Institutes stated that funding uncertainty caused staffing problems—the highest percentage of any of the project types.

Table 30 illustrates some of the changes that have taken place in the demographic characteristics of the GAC, SEA, and Type D Institutes this year compared to last year. General Assistance Centers have maintained the same staff size even though they are working with an average of 12 fewer districts. The composition of their staffs has changed only slightly, as is to be expected since GACs generally are funded for more than one year at a time and report little staff turnover. The site visits underscored this relatively low degree of change in GAC project office organization from 1974-1975 to 1975-1976. The project offices that were visited in both years had many of the same personnel and the same organizational structures as were observed in the previous year. State Education Agencies have increased the average size of their staffs by one, but they also report serving 41 more districts this year. While the minority proportion of their staff has not changed, they do report a fairly substantial increase in the mean percentage of female staff members this year (up 13 percent). Type D Institutes also report a substantial increase in their mean percentage of female staff members (up 16 percent). These figures undoubtedly reflect the amount of staff turnover that takes place by project type and may indicate the extent to which these three project types are undertaking sex desegregation work. As we noted earlier, among these three project types SEAs are undertaking sex desegregation work most frequently and GACs least frequently. Furthermore, Type D Institutes report the greatest amount of staff turnover and

Table 30

CHANGES IN PROJECT OFFICE DEMOGRAPHICS, 1975-1976 TO 1976-1977

Project Office Characteristic	Project Type		
	GAC	SEA	Type D TI
Mean size of total staff	NC[a]	+1	-1
Mean percent female staff	+03	+13	+16
Mean percent minority staff	-06	-02	+04
Mean number of districts served	-12	+41	-3

[a]No change.

GACs the least. Thus, it is not too surprising that GACs show the least change in the sex composition of their staff—they had the least opportunity to make staffing changes and the least reason to do so.

Type D Institutes were the only project type to show a loss of staff since last year. However, they also are serving an average of one-third fewer districts this year. If there is a close relationship between the number of districts served by a Type D Institute and the size of its staff, the reduction in staff can easily be explained. We see from the data in Table 31, however, that this is not the case. With the exception of the SEAs, the size of a project's staff is not correlated significantly with the number of districts served. Rather, size of staff is positively associated with the amount of funding a project receives. For the GAC and SEA, this relationship is significant, while for the Institutes the relationships are positive but not significant. For the SEA, size of staff is also significantly associated with the number of districts it serves. Thus, the following picture emerges. State Education Agencies, which are required to work with any district in their state requesting assistance and which are more apt to deliver short-term, crisis-oriented assistance, staff their projects on the basis of number of districts served and the funding that is available to them. General Assistance Centers and Institutes more typically deal with long-range problems and have a more defined program. The existence of established programs should better enable GACs and TIs to predetermine the staff needed to accomplish their programs. Without defined programs, SEAs would need to project staffing needs by other means—such as the number of districts to be served.

Table 31

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SIZE OF STAFF AND OTHER PROJECT OFFICE DEMOGRAPHICS, BY PROJECT TYPE[a]

Other Project Office Demographics	Total Number of Staff			
	GAC	SEA	Type D TI	Type S TI
Number of districts served	.121	.446[b]	-.130	-.009
Amount of funding	.505[b]	.510[c]	.499	.331

[a]R-correlations.

[b]Significant at the .05 level.

[c]Significant at the .01 level.

Nevertheless, in all cases the size of the staff increases as the project's funding increases—a relationship that is not too surprising, since salaries generally are the largest budget item. This relationship is weakest for the Type S Institutes, however. For them, the strongest relationship is between the number of districts served and the amount of funding they receive (R = .682, significant at the .05 level). The amount of funding and number of districts served were not strongly related for any of the other project types including the Type D Institutes, and it is quite likely that this relationship for the Type S Institute is an artifact of their newness as a Title IV project. It is also possible that the Type S Institutes themselves, and especially

the proposal review panels, were somewhat unfamiliar with the scope of the activities that would be required to meet the sex desegregation needs of districts and, therefore, they may have resorted to a more readily identifiable measure—number of districts served—as a means of allocating resources.

RELATIONSHIP OF ACTIVITIES TO PROJECT DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS[1]

So far we have seen that there is considerable variation among project types in the size of their staffs, the composition of their staffs, and the number of districts they serve. Now we will examine the relationship of these variables to the programs undertaken by these project types. Our analysis showed that the composition of the staffs in terms of sex and ethnicity had no appreciable relationship to the types of activities undertaken by the projects. Size of staff and number of districts served are related to the project's program, however, as the data in Table 32 illustrate. Without considering size of staff for the moment, we see from Table 32 that when GACs work with a small number of districts they undertake *Stage 2* sex desegregation activities more frequently than *Stage 1* activities. As the number of districts they serve increases, the reverse is true. This is understandable, given that *Stage 2* activities deal with more in-depth sex desegregation assistance and would require that a GAC work more closely with individual districts. In their race desegregation activities, a similar pattern emerges. When working with a small number of districts, GACs most frequently undertake *training*, an activity which could be very district specific. General Assistance Centers that work with larger numbers of districts undertake *training* much less frequently but they all report undertaking *programmatic* activities frequently. *Programmatic* activities include the development of curricula and new techniques—programs that could be developed and packaged at the project office and then implemented in a larger number of districts.

State Education Agencies show a different activity pattern than GACs when working with varying numbers of districts. In general, they show an increase in the frequency with which they undertake activities when they increase the number of districts they work with. The one exception to this is in undertaking *Stage 2* sex desegregation activities. It was pointed out earlier that the size of an SEA's staff was significantly correlated with the number of districts they serve. Thus, it appears that the large SEAs—large both in terms of districts served and number of staff—are the most active. Further, it appears that SEAs with a small number of districts primarily undertake sex desegregation work, whereas SEAs with a moderate and large number of districts have a more balanced program. However, for the most part, SEAs serving a small number of districts are located in small northern states. With four exceptions, these states also have low concentrations of minori-

[1] Since there was not a significant linear relationship between size of staff and number of districts served (i.e., one could not serve as a proxy for the other), it became necessary to relate size of staff to the types of activities undertaken while controlling for the number of districts served. By so doing, we avoid equating a project serving 500 districts employing a staff of three with a project serving 20 districts employing a staff of three, which would be somewhat akin to equating an apple with an orange. Unfortunately, since there are so few Institutes, it was not possible to stratify them in this manner and they are therefore excluded from this particular analysis.

Table 32

FREQUENCY OF UNDERTAKING ACTIVITIES
BY NUMBER OF DISTRICTS SERVED

Activity Category	Percent Frequently Undertaking Activities	
	GAC	SEA
Small Number of Districts Served (1-40)[a]		
Sex desegregation		
Stage 1	29	73
Stage 2	60	60
Race desegregation		
Training	71	18
Programmatic	57	33
Desegregation	57	46
Technical assistance	43	0
Moderate Number of Districts Served (41-99)[b]		
Sex desegregation		
Stage 1	44	70
Stage 2	33	29
Race desegregation		
Training	22	30
Programmatic	89	60
Desegregation	22	60
Technical assistance	33	70
Large Number of Districts Served (100 and over)[c]		
Sex desegregation		
Stage 1	50	100
Stage 2	38	40
Race desegregation		
Training	38	50
Programmatic	100	46
Desegregation	38	73
Technical assistance	50	46

[a] N = 7 for GAC, 11 for SEA.

[b] N = 9 for GAC, 10 for SEA.

[c] N = 8 for GAC, 10 for SEA.

ties. The addition of sex desegregation may have provided these SEAs with a more applicable focus than was available when their only responsibilities were in the area of race desegregation.

Turning to Table 33, we now introduce the effect of staff size on the programs of the GAC and SEA, while controlling for number of districts served. Size of staff is significantly correlated with the number of districts served for the SEAs. Therefore, we would expect the data in Table 33 to be less significant for SEAs, since staff size would also be partially controlled for in our control for number of districts. As expected, the relationship between the frequency of undertaking activities and an increase in the size of staff for the SEA is a weak positive or near zero, with one

Table 33

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE SIZE OF STAFF AND TYPE OF ACTIVITIES UNDERTAKEN BY GACs AND SEAs

Activity Category	Size of Staff	
	GAC	SEA
Small Number of Districts Served (1-40)		
Sex desegregation		
Stage 1	.143	.360
Stage 2	-.802	.408
Race desegregation		
Training	.507	-.120
Programmatic	.231	.406
Desegregation	.286	.261
Technical assistance	.067	.098
Moderate Number of Districts Served (41-99)		
Sex desegregation		
Stage 1	-.080	.387
Stage 2	-.128	-.207
Race desegregation		
Training	-.320	.194
Programmatic	.217	-.071
Desegregation	-.411	-.120
Technical assistance	-.354	.310
Large Number of Districts Served (100 and over)		
Sex desegregation		
Stage 1	.606	--
Stage 2	-.668[a]	-.159
Race desegregation		
Training	.188	-.226
Programmatic	--	.000
Desegregation	-.188	.497
Technical assistance	.606	.686[a]

[a]Significant at the .05 level.

exception. For SEAs serving a large number of districts, the larger their staff size the more frequently they undertake race desegregation *technical assistance* activities. Since these activities tend to be district specific, more staff would be needed to undertake them, therefore this relationship follows.

Turning now to the GAC, the data in Table 33 show that there is a relationship between size of staff and activities undertaken, especially for GACs serving less than 40 or over 100 districts. For GACs serving a small number of districts, the larger the staff size the more likely they are to frequently undertake race desegregation activities—especially *training*—and the less likely they are to frequently undertake *Stage 2* sex desegregation activities. The latter relationship is somewhat puzzling. Since *Stage 2* activities are not mandated by law but represent a second level of sex desegregation assistance, we expected GACs to be undertaking *Stage*

2 activities more frequently if they had a larger staff. However, earlier we noted that sex desegregation assistance is ancillary to the GAC's primary thrust—race desegregation assistance. Furthermore, unlike their counterpart SEAs, which serve a small number of districts and are located in less densely populated northern states with smaller concentrations of minorities, GACs that work with a small number of districts tend to be in heavily populated northern states with large concentrations of minorities. It appeared from the fieldwork that these GACs were working selectively with a few districts that have large minority enrollments, and as these GACs receive additional resources in the form of larger staffs they use them to strengthen their program's primary thrust—race desegregation assistance.

In contrast, GACs that work with a large number of districts are primarily located in southern regions. The districts in these regions are more apt to be physically desegregated and in need of second-stage desegregation assistance, such as modifying their curricula, sensitizing personnel, and handling occasional crises. The large number of districts being served probably precludes these GACs from offering much in the way of district specific *training* (38 percent undertake these activities frequently), but they appear to be able to offer the more general kind of *programmatic* assistance (100 percent report undertaking these activities frequently). Furthermore, we would expect GACs serving 100 or more districts to be undertaking more superficial and less long-range types of activities than GACs serving a smaller number of districts, but this appears to be the case only for their sex desegregation program. As their staff resources increase, these GACs undertake *Stage 1* sex desegregation activities more frequently and undertake *Stage 2* sex desegregation activities significantly less often. On the other hand, as the size of their staffs increases, these GACs report undertaking race related *technical assistance* more often—activities for which they are apt to receive a great number of requests from districts in later stages of desegregation.

Thus, it appears that GACs serving few districts do so selectively, since they are primarily located in populous northern areas. The main thrust of their program is related to race desegregation—mainly *training*, and then *programmatic* and *desegregation* assistance; sex desegregation assistance appears ancillary to their main program. As the staff of these GACs increases in size, their focus on race desegregation assistance increases as well. In contrast, GACs serving many districts tend to be located in southern regions where the districts would be in later stages of desegregation. These GACs primarily undertake *programmatic* activities and race related *technical assistance*. In the area of sex desegregation assistance, they primarily undertake *Stage 1* activities. As their staff size increases, they undertake more of these activities. Our fieldwork shows that these differences are due in part to the different nature of race desegregation problems in the newly desegregating northern and western states and those in the south, much of which has been desegregated for several years.

For the most part, the fact that SEAs serve a small number of districts merely reflects that the states in which they are located are less densely populated. Furthermore, the majority of these states have low concentrations of minorities and, therefore, these SEAs undertake sex desegregation assistance to a greater extent than race desegregation assistance. An increase in their staff size is associated with undertaking *programmatic* activities more frequently. State Education Agencies which serve a large number of districts are frequently undertaking *Stage 1* sex

desegregation assistance. In terms of their race desegregation programs they are most frequently undertaking *desegregation* activities, and next, *training*. In general, SEAs serving a large number of districts appear to be more active and to have more balanced programs than SEAs serving a small number of districts. Finally, an increase in the size of their staffs is associated with undertaking *desegregation* and *technical assistance* activities more frequently.

This picture is substantiated by the data in Table 34. In general, they show that as the size of their staffs increases, GACs that serve a small number of districts devote fewer of their project resources to sex desegregation work, whereas GACs that serve larger numbers of districts devote more of their projects' resources to sex desegregation work. This is consistent with our earlier findings that GACs serving a small number of districts have focused race desegregation programs, whereas GACs serving a larger number of districts act more as general, all-purpose agencies.

The data in Table 34 show an opposite pattern for the SEA. As the size of their staff increases, SEAs serving a small number of districts (those located in less densely populated states with low concentrations of minorities) spend more of their projects' resources on sex desegregation work. State Education Agencies serving larger numbers of districts devote fewer resources to sex desegregation work as the

Table 34

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SIZE OF STAFF AND AMOUNT OF PROJECT RESOURCES SPENT ON SEX DESEGREGATION WORK, GACs AND SEAs

Project Resources Spent on Sex Desegregation Work	Size of Staff	
	GAC	SEA
Small Number of Districts Served (1-40)		
Director's time	-.231	.238
Staff time	-.267	.707
Budget	-.420	.463
Activities	-.671	.385
Moderate Number of Districts Served (41-99)		
Director's time	.421	-.280
Staff time	.105	-.327
Budget	.000	-.668[a]
Activities	-.138	-.327
Large Number of Districts Served (100 and over)		
Director's time	.056	-.270
Staff time	.560	-.095
Budget	.125	-.271
Activities	.560	-.167

[a]Significant at the .05 level.

size of their staffs increases and, in general, implement more balanced programs in terms of race desegregation and sex desegregation assistance.

Thus, these data suggest that GACs and SEAs are being selective in the extent to which they offer sex desegregation activities. General Assistance Centers that have chosen to limit their services to a small number of districts also appear to have chosen to offer few sex desegregation services. On the other hand, GACs that serve as general all-purpose agencies to a large number of districts have chosen to offer sex desegregation activities more frequently, probably because these activities are similar to the types of race desegregation activities they are already offering.

In the case of the SEA, those working with a small number of districts are primarily offering sex desegregation services, partially because the states in which they are located have little need of race desegregation assistance. State Education Agencies serving a large number of districts are providing both race and sex desegregation assistance, since they are located in states that would need race desegregation assistance.

IMPLEMENTATION PROBLEMS

Having examined the relationships between staff composition, number of districts served, and activities undertaken, we will now examine the problems experienced by each project type while trying to implement their programs. The mail questionnaires asked project directors to report the incidence of certain problems while staffing and planning their programs; the questionnaires sent to project staff asked them to report on any problems they experienced while implementing their race desegregation or sex desegregation programs in the districts. The responses to the project director questionnaires and their relationship to project office characteristics will be reported in this section, while the responses to staff questionnaires will be reported on and analyzed in Sec. VI, which deals with the operations of the projects at the district level.

Staffing Problems

Table 35 shows the frequency with which the directors of the four project types report experiencing various problems while trying to staff their projects. Compared to the other project types, Type S Institutes had the greatest number of problems. This is to be expected, since the Type S Institutes are newly funded this year. They are also a new type of Title IV project, and they operate in a relatively new field where there are probably few "experts" available. Actually, what is surprising is that so few Type S Institutes reported experiencing some of these problems. Seventy-eight percent experienced problems trying to staff their programs because of funding uncertainty. Forty-four percent of them had problems finding qualified staff, and an equal number had a problem with the lengthy start-up time needed to train new staff members. Our responses from the staff questionnaire indicate that roughly one-third of the Type S Institute staff members were recruited from the host institution, one-third from another college or university, 20 percent from school districts, and the remainder from other special projects. Interestingly, although few Type S staff report working on Title IV three-quarters time or more (22

Table 35

STAFFING PROBLEMS

Problem	Percent Experiencing Problem			
	GAC	SEA	Type D TI	Type S TI
Inability to find qualified staff	5	25	21	44
Inability to offer competitive salaries	16	28	21	22
Uncertainty of funding	50	39	86	78
Staff turnover	13	11	14	0
Inability to get staff to function as team	0	6	14	22
Lengthy start-up time needed	16	22	14	44

percent), only 40 percent report that they have other professional duties as well. These figures indicate that many of the Type S staff work only part-time, in contrast to Type D staff who work part-time on Title IV and part-time elsewhere.

If we now exclude Type S Institutes from the analysis, we see from Table 35 that of the remaining three project types, GACs report experiencing fewer staffing problems than either SEAs or Type D Institutes. State Education Agencies more often than GACs or Type D Institutes report problems in offering competitive salaries (28 percent), finding qualified staff (25 percent), and the lengthy start-up time needed to train new staff members (22 percent). In the field, this appeared to reflect the organizational difficulties imposed by the requirement that the SEA staff be hired through the civil service system. State Education Agency staff members are likely to have been recruited from a college or university or from various desegregation and educational projects operating at the local, state, or national level. Although 84 percent of the SEA staff report working three-quarters time or more on Title IV, they are more likely than other project staffs to report having other professional duties as well. These duties are primarily administering or working on other special projects.

The problems experienced by Type D Institutes more frequently than by GACs or SEAs relate to their uncertainty of funding from year to year (86 percent), staff turnover (14 percent), and their inability to get staff to function as a team (14 percent). Forty-four percent of the Type D Institute staff members have other professional duties in addition to Title IV, and these duties are primarily teaching at a college or university or consulting for other districts or projects. Their most recent jobs prior to joining Title IV were teaching at the host institution, working on other special projects, or working in school districts. What is surprising is that so few Type D Institute directors perceive staff turnover to be a problem, considering that all of them reported hiring all new staff members. This seems to indicate that Type D staff members can be "interchanged" without undue disruption to the operation of the project.

As we mentioned before, GACs experience the fewest problems while trying to staff their projects. In one sense we could have predicted this, since the staffs of GACs are the most stable from year to year. General Assistance Centers' staff members are likely to be working on Title IV three-quarters time or more (82 percent) and are the least likely of any of the project staffs to have professional duties other than Title IV (16 percent).

In addition, it is also interesting to note if other organizational characteristics of the project types might account, in part, for their differentially experienced staffing problems. For example, it might appear that the way in which projects first came in contact with the districts they served would affect the staffing of their projects. The argument could then be made that staffing requirements would remain more stable and free of problems if projects were able to exercise more control over the selection of districts with whom they worked. The data in Table 36 show that the TIs are more apt to initiate contact with the districts than are GACs and SEAs. In the case of the SEA, the project directors report virtually no difference in the extent to which they initiate the contact or the districts initiate the contact. General Assistance Centers, however, report a greater frequency of district-initiated contact than project-initiated contact. Using these data as a rough approximation of project control over the selection of districts with whom they work, we would then expect a negative relationship between staffing problems and project initiation of contact and, conversely, a positive relationship between staffing problems and district initiation of contact. Our expectations were not confirmed by the data, however. For the most part there was no association between these two variables, and when there was an association it was in the opposite direction from the one expected. Our fieldwork experiences lead us to believe that our expectations are still correct but that the variable—method of contacting districts—is inadequate as a measure of project control over the selection of districts worked with.

Table 36

METHOD OF CONTACTING DISTRICTS

Method of Contacting	Percent Responding "Quite a Lot" or "Great Deal"			
	GAC	SEA	Type D TI	Type S TI
Project contacts districts	87	86	100	100
Districts contact project	100	89	50	50

A second characteristic of project offices that we felt might affect the extent to which they experienced problems with their staffing was the way in which their staff was organized. In our previous study, we found that organizational characteristics such as having a long-range plan with specific milestones and a clear delineation of staff responsibilities had a positive impact on the service delivery of GACs, but not SEAs or TIs. Consequently, in this study we were interested in determining how these organizational characteristics were related to the internal operation of the projects. Since we felt that staff organization for an Institute would be much different than for either a GAC or SEA, given the small number of full-time staff and small number of districts worked with, we asked questions concerning the specialization of staff and their organization of GACs and SEAs only. From the data in Table 37, we see that GAC staffs are more apt than SEA staffs to be specialized by areas, such as race desegregation or sex desegregation. On the other hand, GACs and SEAs use a team versus individual approach for serving districts to the same

Table 37

ORGANIZATION OF STAFF

Organizational Approach	Percent Responding	
	GAC	SEA
Staff members are not specialized by areas	33	46
Some staff members are specialized	25	14
Staff members are specialized by areas	25	11
A team is responsible for serving each district	46	47
One person is primarily responsible for serving each district	38	38

extent. These figures probably reflect the fact that GAC programs are more predetermined and, thus, GAC directors are able to select staff with specific areas of expertise to carry out their programs. State Education Agency programs are less well-defined, since SEAs must work with any district that requests assistance at any time. Therefore, SEA directors would be less able to hire specialized staff, or to have their staff function in only one specialty area. Although the associations are not statistically significant, greater staff specialization is associated with GACs' and SEAs' experiencing fewer problems while staffing their projects ($-.245$ and $-.331$, respectively). For SEAs, having their staffs work individually rather than in a team for serving districts is also associated with experiencing fewer staffing problems ($-.359$).

From last year's study, we determined that the preproposal stage was a critical phase in an Institute's operation. It is during this stage that an Institute and the districts with whom it will work come together and plan the Institute's program. This year we were interested in how the characteristics of the resultant program impacted on the staffing of an Institute. From Table 38 we see that the Type D Institutes are more apt to let the districts prescribe the activities to be undertaken, whereas the Type S Institutes are more apt to initiate their own lists of activities to be undertaken. Surprisingly, though, Type D Institutes are more apt to undertake similar programs in each district than are the Type S Institutes, despite the heavier reliance of Type D Institutes on district specification of activities. These differences might be due to the different foci of these projects. To comply with Title IX, districts must meet certain specified requirements. Therefore, Type S Institutes are in a position to anticipate the differing needs of their districts in the area of sex desegregation and to come in with a prescribed set of activities. The primary focus of the Type D Institutes, however, is on race desegregation assistance. In this area the needs of their districts would depend on the stage they were in with respect to school desegregation as well as on other district characteristics such as size and racial composition of their student body and staff. Therefore, it probably behooves the Type D Institute to let their districts initiate the activities to be undertaken and for them, in turn, to select and agree to offer those activities that best meet their own and their clients' needs. However, our analysis showed that Type D Institutes

Table 38

INSTITUTE PROGRAM CHARACTERISTICS

Program Characteristic	Percent Responding	
	Type D TI	Type S TI
Determination of program activities		
District initiated	57	44
Project initiated	43	56
Uniformity of program		
Offer different program in each district	10	29
Offer similar programs in each district	90	71

that initiate the activities to be undertaken to a greater extent and that offer similar programs in each district experience fewer staffing problems (−.444 and −.313, respectively). Although these relationships are not statistically significant, they do suggest that Desegregation Institutes that are narrowly focused and more free of pressure from their client districts in selection of activities experience fewer staffing problems. These relationships were even weaker, or nonexistent, for the Type S Institutes, however.

We have seen, then, that various project office characteristics are only marginally related to the extent to which these four Title IV projects report experiencing staffing problems. We were also interested in whether or not problems in staffing were related to the degree to which the various project types undertook sex desegregation work. We expected greater involvement in sex desegregation work to be associated with experiencing greater staffing problems for all project types, assuming that the new area of responsibility would require new staffing arrangements. However, there was no association between the extent to which projects undertook sex desegregation work and the extent to which they reported problems staffing their projects for any of the project types. In other words, the additional responsibility given the projects in the area of sex desegregation did not create staffing problems for them. This lack of association can be explained by the fact that most of the GAC, SEA, and Type D Institute directors report using the same staff members to deliver both race and sex desegregation assistance (82 percent, 86 percent, and 71 percent of the directors, respectively, report doing so frequently or a great deal). Thus, the addition of sex desegregation work to their existing Title IV responsibilities has not led to new staffing arrangements, or concomitantly, to additional staffing problems.

Furthermore, the extent to which projects experienced staffing problems showed little association with the activity profiles of these Title IV projects, as can be seen from the data in Table 39. In general, although GACs experience the fewest staffing problems, their programs are most affected by staffing difficulties—that is, those GACs that experience the most staffing problems undertake *training* activities significantly less often. They are also less apt to undertake *technical assistance* activities. What training and technical assistance activities have in common is that they both require a large number of personnel, since they tend to be district specific.

Table 39

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN STAFFING PROBLEMS AND ACTIVITY PROFILES, BY PROJECT TYPE

Activity Category	Extent to Which Staffing Problems Experienced			
	GAC	SEA	Type D TI	Type S TI
Sex desegregation				
Stage 1	-.045	.130	-.408	--
Stage 2	-.037	.000	.082	-.490
Race desegregation				
Training	-.442[a]	.259	.167	NA
Programmatic	.160	.000	.417	NA
Desegregation	-.060	.120	.247	NA
Technical assistance	-.300	.083	-.208	NA

[a]Significant at the .05 level.

These relationships are not carried over to the other project types, however. In fact, staffing problems have virtually no relationship to the SEA's activity profile. In the case of the Type S Institute, experiencing greater staffing difficulties is associated with undertaking *Stage 2* activities less often. This is understandable, since *Stage 2* activities are not required by the Title IX regulations and would, therefore, be the most likely to be dropped should sufficient staff not be available. On the other hand, for the Type D Institute, experiencing greater staffing difficulties is associated with undertaking *programmatic* activities more often and undertaking sex desegregation *Stage 1* activities less often. Race desegregation assistance is the primary focus of the Type D Institutes, however, so it stands to reason that if they experienced staffing difficulties they would cut back on their sex desegregation work and instead focus more narrowly on one of the types of race desegregation assistance for which they have the most expertise.

We have seen that, in general, Type S Institutes experience the greatest number of problems while trying to staff their programs—undoubtedly because of their newness in Title IV. Experiencing these problems is not associated significantly with any of the organizational characteristics we identified, but the more they experience these problems the less apt they are to frequently undertake *Stage 2* sex desegregation assistance.

Organizational characteristics also had little effect on the extent to which GACs, SEAs, or Type D Institutes report experiencing staffing problems. General Assistance Centers report experiencing the fewest problems but they also have the least staff turnover. Since these three project types primarily use the same staff members to deliver both race and sex desegregation assistance, providing sex desegregation assistance has not led to significantly greater staffing problems. For the SEAs, experiencing staffing problems is not associated with any alteration to their activity profile, whereas for the GAC the greater their staffing difficulties the less they undertake *training* and *technical assistance*. For the Type D Institute, experiencing greater staffing difficulties is associated with undertaking *Stage 1* sex desegregation assistance less often and *programmatic* assistance more often.

Planning Problems

We turn now to an examination of the extent to which these four Title IV projects report problems in planning their programs. Table 40 illustrates the responses of the project directors to this question. In comparison to other project types, GACs report experiencing the greatest number of planning problems. They primarily report difficulty with working around district schedules (87 percent), serving a large number of districts (74 percent), and tailoring their program to different levels of district personnel (74 percent). By way of contrast, the only problem cited more frequently by SEAs than by other project types is erratic requests from the districts for assistance (44 percent). This underscores the differences in the service delivery of these two project types. Tending to have more defined programs that deal with long-range problems, GACs have more difficulties when they have to make changes in their programs to accommodate district schedules, or when they have to expand the scope of their programs to accommodate additional districts or levels of personnel. State Education Agencies, on the other hand, respond to whatever requests for assistance they receive. They have most difficulty with the fact that these requests are erratic, making it difficult to plan their programs.

Although Type S Institutes reported the greatest number of problems while trying to staff their programs, they report only one problem more frequently than other project types while trying to plan their programs. This problem is contacting the appropriate district personnel (34 percent). Once again, this problem reflects the newness of the Type S Institutes and the fact that they are still working to establish a relationship with the districts they serve. A majority of the responding Type D Institutes were funded as Desegregation Institutes last year and are working with some or all of the same districts this year, so we would expect the planning problems they experience most often to reflect a more longitudinal focus. In fact, this was the case. The problems reported more frequently by Type D Institutes than by other project types are: changing needs of school districts (54 percent), legal complications at the district level (30 percent), and personnel turnover in the districts (15 percent).

Table 40

PLANNING PROBLEMS

Planning Problem	Percent Responding "Almost Always" or "Frequently"			
	GAC	SEA	Type D TI	Type S TI
Changing needs of school district	48	50	54	22
Working around district schedules	87	60	64	77
Legal complication at district level	13	21	30	11
Erratic requests for assistance	26	44	25	12
Having to provide diverse activities	48	44	46	37
Large number of districts served	74	55	30	22
Tailoring program to different levels	74	44	46	66
Contacting appropriate personnel	22	15	8	34
Personnel turnover in districts	4	9	15	0

Duplicating the analysis that was undertaken in our examination of the project offices' staffing difficulties, we again looked at the relationship of project office characteristics and reported planning problems. The method of contacting districts (whether project initiated or district initiated) was not significantly associated with the extent to which projects experienced difficulty in planning their programs. Whether GAC and SEA staffs worked individually or in teams in serving districts was also not significantly associated with the extent to which projects experienced difficulties in planning, nor was there a relationship between GACs' and SEAs' experiencing planning problems and whether or not their staffs were organized by specialty areas. Thus, for GACs and SEAs it appears that while their *method of operating* leads them to experience different planning problems, within each of these project types, different *organizational arrangements* neither increase nor decrease the extent to which they experience these problems.

While our analysis for the TIs revealed no significant associations, it did show that Type D Institutes offering similar programs in each of the districts they serve, and suggesting the activities to be undertaken to the districts rather than vice versa, report experiencing fewer problems while trying to plan their programs ($-.240$ and $-.347$, respectively). Once again, these data suggest that the more autonomous Type D Institutes experience fewer problems. On the other hand, Type S Institutes suggesting the activities to be undertaken to the districts report experiencing a greater number of planning problems ($-.494$). Again, this dissimilarity between the Type D Institute data is probably attributable to the newness of the Type S Institutes. For one, they did not yet have a constituency, nor had they proven their worth to the districts they were going to serve. Therefore, too aggressive an approach on their part in telling the districts what they felt they needed could have caused them additional planning problems by alienating the districts. Second, and even more likely, Type S Institutes may not yet have had a good feeling for what was even feasible for them to undertake. They may have been attempting to undertake too many diverse activities, or activities that were too complicated, causing greater planning problems. Unfortunately, we can only suggest some possibilities for these data configurations, since we were unable to site-visit any Type S Institutes.

In Table 41, we show the relationship between the activity profiles of the four project types and the extent to which each of them report experiencing difficulty in planning their programs. In general, undertaking race desegregation activities more frequently is associated with experiencing more planning problems. These relationships are significant in only one case, however: GACs that undertake *desegregation* activities more frequently experience planning difficulties significantly more often. Although *desegregation* activities were not a major component of their activity profiles (see Sec. IV), the highly district specific nature of these activities appear to give GACs problems when they do attempt to undertake them. Interestingly, although the relationships are very weak, undertaking sex desegregation activities frequently is associated with experiencing planning difficulties more frequently for the GACs and SEAs, and less frequently for the two types of TIs. However, for the most part, these relationships are weak, and we conclude that the incidence of experiencing planning difficulties shows little association with the activity profiles of the four Title IV projects.

What we have seen, then, is that in terms of planning their programs, GACs report experiencing the greatest number of problems. Since their programs are

Table 41

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN EXTENT TO WHICH PLANNING PROBLEMS ARE EXPERIENCED AND ACTIVITIES UNDERTAKEN, BY PROJECT TYPE

Activity Category	Frequency of Reporting Planning Problems			
	GAC	SEA	Type D TI	Type S TI
Sex desegregation				
Stage 1	.191	.230	-.387	.000
Stage 2	.069	.012	-.005	-.351
Race desegregation				
Training	.077	.100	.052	NA
Programmatic	.100	.148	.433	NA
Desegregation	.479[a]	.223	.300	NA
Technical assistance	.159	.168	.005	NA

[a]Significant at the .05 level.

better established. GACs have greater problems when it becomes necessary to modify or adapt their programs to the schedules and personnel of the districts. State Education Agencies report few problems. Those they do have relate to erratic requests for assistance from the districts. The planning problems reported by Type D Institutes stem from trying to carry over a program from one year to the next, and the major planning problems experienced by the Type S Institutes relate to the newness of their operation. In the case of all four project types, different organizational patterns showed little relationship to the planning problems they were experiencing. Finally, the activities undertaken by these project types also showed little relationship to the extent to which they were experiencing planning problems, with one exception: GACs undertaking *desegregation* activities more frequently reported experiencing a greater number of planning problems. Having looked at the environments in which Title IV projects function and their internal operations —their structure, staffing, and activities—we now turn to an examination of the services provided to the ultimate user of Title IV—the client school districts.

VI. CLIENT SCHOOL DISTRICTS

In the previous sections we have focused on the differing structures of the Title IV project types and their impact on certain key variables. At this point we will expand our discussion to include the recipients of Title IV activities: the client school districts.

Several important points regarding client school districts emerged from our earlier report. We found that the different project types all evidenced distinct interaction patterns with their clients and in fact the amenability of the school district was of critical importance to the success of certain project types. The expansion of Title IV project responsibilities to include sex desegregation assistance and the creation of a Type S Training Institute to deal exclusively with sex desegregation assistance afforded us the opportunity to gain more information about the impact of client school district characteristics and their patterns of interaction with the project types. Consequently, we expanded and refined our requirements for district data. Budget constraints limited our ability to gather extensive district information in the field and we have therefore used the staff questionnaires as the basis of the analysis presented below.

We will begin this section by discussing the responses to the mail questionnaire. We are interested in comparing responses both across project types and within project types, with primary emphasis on the major points arising from analysis of the staff questionnaires. These data will be used to set the stage for a more detailed analysis of the impact of certain key variables on district characteristics and district interaction patterns within the project types.

DISTRICT CHARACTERISTICS

As was pointed out earlier, Title IV projects provide for different types of services to be delivered to a wide variety of client school districts by each project type. Table 42 illustrates some of the demographic characteristics of the client districts for each project type. Type D Institutes serve districts that are considerably larger, on the average, than any other project type. This is not surprising, because TIs are normally located at colleges near urban centers and provide services to a small number of districts nearby. This is further substantiated by the relatively high percentage of urban districts the Type D TIs report as clients in our sample. Furthermore, both GACs and Type D TIs report interacting with districts having larger minority enrollments than the SEA clients. In addition, the clients of the GACs and Type D TIs show the highest percentage receiving ESAA funds. These data suggest that GACs and Type D TIs are serving districts with an immediate need for race desegregation services. The second entry in Table 42 shows the question asked of respondents on estimating how typical the work done in the particular district was, compared to the services provided to all other districts served by the project (recall that all the data presented in this section are keyed to randomly selected districts receiving sex desegregation services). The answers substantiate the project descriptions made in last year's analysis. The SEAs, with

Table 42

CLIENT DISTRICT CHARACTERISTICS[a]

Characteristic	GAC	SEA	Type D TI	Type S TI
Mean student enrollment	14,110	22,058	45,209	19,739
Percent of districts reported as "typical" or "very typical"	52	38	76	34
Percent minority enrollment (mean)	33	26	35	13
Percent of districts receiving ESAA[b] monies	54	35	61	NA
Percent of urban districts	35	3[illegible]	47	42

[a]As mentioned earlier, these client districts were sampled randomly from lists provided by the projects. Only districts in which some sex desegregation activities were undertaken were included.

[b]Emergency School Aid Act.

their quick response mode of delivering services to clients on an as-needed basis, report the least typicality of the three project types funded last year. This is understandable for two reasons. First, SEAs tend to undertake district-specific activities. Second, given that SEAs work with the largest number of districts (as shown in Sec. V), our sampling procedure of randomly selecting two client districts per project office resulted in our sampling a smaller proportion of SEA client districts than any other project type. The GACs and Type D TIs show a much higher degree of typicality than the SEAs. This is not surprising, since their services are more well-defined than the SEAs'. Furthermore, the Type D TIs serve a much smaller number of clients than the GACs and one would expect them, therefore, to report an even higher degree of typicality. The Type S TIs are anomalous with the lowest rating of typicality. It is not clear whether this reflects the diversity of services they provide, or their newness as a Title IV project.

Table 43a illustrates the position of the sampled districts with respect to Title IX compliance, and Table 43b illustrates the desegregation status of the districts. While Title IX is a relatively new federal program, strict deadlines for compliance are built into the legislation. Therefore, it is not surprising that the overwhelming majority of districts are in the process of complying. In addition, the Type S TIs evidence the largest number of districts already in compliance. Table 43b shows that there is more variation in desegregation status than in Title IX compliance. This variation is consistent with the different desegregation roles of the Title IV projects. Training Institutes are set up to provide short-term intensive assistance to districts with specific race desegregation needs. One might expect their districts to be under court order more often than any of the other project types and this fact was observed. The GACs evidence the largest number of client districts previously under court order. This is also an expected result, given the longevity of GAC funding and the long-term service nature of the GAC. The SEAs, on the other hand, serve the largest number of districts never under court order and not voluntarily desegregating. State Education Agencies are required to provide services to all requesting districts in the state, and consequently one would expect more variation in their desegregation status.

Table 43a

STAGE OF COMPLIANCE WITH TITLE IX, BY DISTRICT
(In percent)

Stage of Compliance	GAC Districts	SEA Districts	Type D TI Districts	Type S TI Districts
Not yet started to comply	0	0	0	0
Planning for compliance	6	8	0	8
In process of compliance	87	81	90	77
In full compliance	6	11	10	15

Table 43b

STAGE OF COMPLIANCE WITH DESEGREGATION ORDERS, BY DISTRICT
(In percent)

Stage of Compliance	GAC Districts	SEA Districts	Type D TI Districts
District has never been under court order and is not voluntarily desegregating	13	18	14
District voluntarily desegregating; never under court order	46	44	21
District now under court order	16	26	50
District was once under court order; now in compliance	24	12	14

To further delineate the stage of the district, staff respondents were asked to indicate whether their districts were in process or had completed a number of specific policies to achieve Title IX compliance and/or racial equality (see Tables 44a and 44b). Type S TIs report the highest percentage of districts having enacted the sex desegregation policies listed. Turning to the other three project types and looking at the last two sex desegregation policies listed and the last four desegregation policies listed (policies that we feel typify the later stages of Title IX compliance and school desegregation), we find that the Type D TI clients are in earlier stages of school desegregation than either the GAC or SEA clients. Therefore, their clients would be in need of the intensive assistance provided by Type D TIs. Client districts of the SEAs are more likely to have enacted the later stages of sex desegregation policies than are clients of either the GACs or Type D TIs.

CLIENT DISTRICT CONTACTS

To maintain a viable relationship with their client school districts, Title IV projects must establish ongoing contact with a particular person in the district. This

Table 44a

DISTRICTS ENACTING SEX DESEGREGATION POLICY
(In percent)[a]

Status	GAC	SEA	Type D TI	Type S TI
Enacting a policy of nondiscrimination on the basis of sex	86	87	78	92
Establishing a grievance procedure for sex discrimination	77	87	67	100
Doing a needs assessment in the area of sex discrimination	69	85	70	100
Appointing a Title IX coordinator	83	84	60	100
Notifying students, parents, staff, community of existence of a sex nondiscrimination policy, grievance procedure, and Title IX coordinator	80	85	50	100
Eliminating separate or unequal athletic facilities	60	74	62	100
Providing students an equal access to all courses	69	83	62	92

[a]Combined percentage reporting district either "in process" or "completed."

Table 44b

DISTRICTS ENACTING RACE DESEGREGATION POLICY
(In percent)[a]

Status	GAC	SEA	Type D TI
Enacting a desegregation plan	78	72	87
Establishing a grievance procedure for racial and ethnic discrimination	61	56	40
Doing a needs assessment in the area of racial and ethnic discrimination	68	72	78
Racially balancing a majority of its schools	58	56	33
Racially balancing all of its schools	65	64	67
Racially balancing its teaching staff	66	67	50
Racially balancing its administrative staff	60	49	40

[a]Combined percentage reporting district either "in process" or "completed."

person serves as the organizational point of reference for the Title IV project with its service delivery system in that district. In terms of sex desegregation assistance, the GACs and SEAs use the superintendent most often as their contact (see Table 45). Additionally, the GACs have a high degree of contact with the Title IX coordinator. For the SEAs, however, the district superintendent serves as the major contact person almost twice as often as the second-ranking director of instruction. Recalling our findings in the previous report, this is an expected result. We found that the Title IV unit in the State Department of Education was often staffed by people with prior experience in the State Department. In their previous jobs they often had contacts in the administrative level of a school district. It is not surprising that this pattern would continue in their Title IV work. As further substantiation for this point, we found that staff members for the SEAs most often reported that their method of becoming familiar with a client district was through prior contact. The GACs, however, did not have an institutional framework from which prior administrative contacts in districts were established before the Center was funded. Consequently, the GACs establish contacts with various levels of personnel in the districts.

A different pattern emerges when we look at the TIs. Relying on data gathered in the previous year's study, we found that the Institutes' focus on training often led to heavy concentrations of services at the school building level (e.g., principals and teachers). The Type D TIs evidence a continuation of this pattern this year. The Type S TIs, however, show a somewhat different pattern. We feel that their concentration at the assistant superintendent and Title IX coordinator level is a reflection of their need to establish themselves with the administrative level in a school district.

Table 45

DISTRICT CONTACT PERSON

Contact Person	Percent Reporting Contact[a]						
	GAC		SEA		Type D TI		Type S TI
	Sex	Race	Sex	Race	Sex	Race	Sex
District superintendent	22	31	34	39	11	13	9
Assistant superintendent	6	18	11	13		6	36
Affirmative action officer			6	3			19
Title IX coordinator	19		9		22		36
Title IV contact person			3	3			
Human relations specialist	13	11	9	13			
EEO coordinator		3					
ESAA director	9	10		8		6	
Multicultural director				3	11	6	
Director of instruction	13	18	17	3		13	
Principal		8		5	33	38	
Teacher					22	13	

[a]First entry is the percentage of staff reporting contact with a given level of personnel in conjunction with the project's sex desegregation assistance; second entry refers to racial desegregation assistance.

SEX DESEGREGATION ACTIVITIES

In general, the sex desegregation activity profiles reported by the staff of the Title IV projects are very similar to those reported by the directors of these projects (see Sec. IV). In terms of the specific activities undertaken, we see from Table 46 that GAC staffs report most frequently undertaking the dissemination of materials, helping districts to understand their Title IX responsibilities, sensitizing school

Table 46

PROJECT STAFF SEX DESEGREGATION ACTIVITY PROFILE

Activity	Percent Reporting Activities Occupy Most of Their Time in the District			
	GAC	SEA	Type D TI	Type S TI
Develop procedures to insure students equal access to courses	26	38	30	38
Develop procedures to identify sex-stereotyped textbooks	34	24	80	46
Develop curricula	11	22	20	46
Help assess sex desegregation needs	49	47	50	54
Help districts identify sexist policies	43	46	60	77
Devise procedures to eliminate sex discrimination in staffing	26	28	40	38
Help districts locate qualified coed personnel	9	9	0	16
Develop procedures to insure students equal access to athletics	23	35	30	38
Develop procedures to insure students equal access to extracurricular activities	26	30	40	46
Provide counselors with new techniques	26	16	10	46
Sensitize counselors	26	9	40	59
Sensitize school administrators	60	40	30	100
Sensitize school staffs	62	(a)	70	70
Sensitize other pupil contact personnel	29	9	20	46
Hold multidistrict workshops to facilitate sharing	46	39	60	46
Develop a Title IX plan for districts	31	42	0	54
Help districts understand Title IX responsibilities	68	62	40	92
Disseminate materials on sex discrimination	66	57	90	85
Help districts write proposals	0	16	(b)	(b)
Train school personnel to serve as trainers	(c)	(c)	36	62
Work with trainers in their districts	(c)	(c)	46	47
Contact participants systematically	(c)	(c)	55	54
Observe administrators	(c)	(c)	18	0
Observe teachers	(c)	(c)	46	0

[a]Not asked of SEA staff.

[b]Not asked of Institute staff.

[c]Not asked of GAC and SEA staff.

staffs and administrators, performing needs assessment, and offering multidistrict workshops. Disseminating materials and helping districts understand their Title IX responsibilities could be thought of as orientation types of activities geared to let the districts know about Title IX and their responsibilities under the law while establishing the GAC's credibility in this new service area. Establishing project credibility in sex desegregation is a necessary first step, and we see that the SEAs also rank these activities higher than any others. However, GACs then focus on training activities (sensitizing school administrators and school staffs), whereas SEAs conduct needs assessment and help districts identify sexist policies next most frequently. This divergence in activity profiles is entirely consistent with last year's analysis. The GACs were pictured as multipurpose organizations dealing with all levels of a school and focusing on training, while the SEAs often dealt with the administration of a school district in providing technical assistance. It appears that the same distinctions hold true for sex desegregation assistance.

In the Type D TIs, we see again the focus on disseminating materials. The TI staffs then report concentrating on identifying sex stereotypes in textbooks, sensitizing school staffs, holding multidistrict workshops, and helping districts to identify sexist policies. Here again, we see much the same pattern as evidenced in last year's analysis with the TIs concentrating on activities geared to the building level in a school district (i.e., principals and teachers).

It is also interesting to note that looking across project types we find that Type D TIs report a comparatively high percentage of staff undertaking the same activities. We feel that this is an indication that Type D TIs, as a group, show marked similarity in the activities that constitute their sex desegregation program. Having seen earlier that Type D TIs tend to piggyback their sex desegregation activities onto their race desegregation activities, we suspected that the sex desegregation activities showing the highest percentage of agreement would be strongly correlated with their counterpart race desegregation activities. We found this to be the case.

RACE DESEGREGATION ACTIVITIES

The race desegregation activities undertaken in the sampled districts show much the same separation as in sex desegregation (see Table 47). The GAC staffs report focusing on training school personnel, developing new instructional techniques, developing curricula, and sensitizing school staffs. The Type D TI staffs also focus on training school personnel, developing new instructional techniques, sensitizing school staffs, and sensitizing pupil contact personnel. Emerging from these responses is a pattern consistent with that found in last year's analysis. The GACs and Type D TIs are once again involved in training and programmatic activities as well as in human relations. The SEA staffs, on the other hand, most frequently report helping districts to understand their responsibilities under guidelines, doing needs assessment, and then sensitizing and training school staffs. They are less likely than GACs and Type D TIs to undertake programmatic assistance. Again, these data are consistent with the race desegregation activity profiles that were determined at the project office level.

Table 47

PROJECT STAFF RACE DESEGREGATION ACTIVITY PROFILE

Activity	Percent Reporting Activities Occupy Most of Their Time in the District		
	GAC	SEA	Type D TI
Establish needs assessment procedures	45	53	40
Help districts locate minority personnel	5	11	6
Develop new instructional techniques	59	14	63
Develop curricula	54	16	50
Develop new administrative techniques	15	18	31
Develop new counseling techniques	16	18	25
Develop techniques for school/community interaction	41	17	38
Train and hold workshops with school personnel	69	41	88
Train personnel responsible for in-service	37	24	44
Train local directors of desegregation projects	26	14	6
Hold workshops to sensitize administrators	36	47	19
Hold workshops to sensitize school staff	54	37	56
Hold workshops to sensitize pupil contact personnel	36	16	50
Hold multidistrict workshops to facilitate sharing	28	24	38
Help districts establish evaluation techniques	13	18	25
Assist districts in developing desegregation plans	13	17	19
Help districts assess desegregation capabilities	10	16	19
Help districts cope with crises	16	23	25
Help districts understand responsibilities under guidelines	26	59	25
Help districts write proposals	21	36	0
Conduct surveys	15	13	25
Disseminate materials	32	32	44
Train school personnel to serve as trainers	(a)	(a)	63
Work with trainers in their districts	(a)	(a)	75
Contact participants systematically	(a)	(a)	63
Observe administrators	(a)	(a)	31
Observe teachers	(a)	(a)	56

[a]Not asked of GAC and SEA staff.

DISTRICT INTERACTION

To further distinguish service delivery patterns across project types, staff members were asked a series of questions concerning the level of district personnel they interact with when delivering their services. For the most part, we found that delivery of sex desegregation assistance did not drastically alter their race desegregation interaction patterns. Essentially, the GAC, SEA, and Type D Institute staffs report receiving participation in planning and support for their sex and race desegregation program from the same level of district personnel. For GACs and Type D TIs, the district personnel with whom they have the greatest interaction are central office staff, principals, and teachers. The SEAs interacted most frequently with district superintendents, central office staff, and principals. However, there is greater divergence between the sex and race desegregation programs of these project types when we examine the district personnel to whom their activities are most frequently directed.

Table 48 indicates the top three responses for each project type. General Assistance Center staffs report targeting teachers, principals, and counselors when delivering race desegregation assistance. In terms of their sex desegregation program they report targeting principals, then central office staff, and finally teachers. Their district interaction pattern remains almost constant when delivering both types of assistance, although sex desegregation assistance does involve them with the administrative level to a greater degree than does their race desegregation work.

Table 48

TARGETS OF PROJECT ACTIVITIES

Target	GAC		SEA		Type D TI	
	Race	Sex	Race	Sex	Race	Sex
District superintendent			2	3		
Other central office		2	1	1		2
Principals	2	1	1	3	3	2
Teachers	1	3	2	2	1	1
Counselors	3				2	3

State Education Agencies target their race desegregation activities first to central office staff and principals equally, and next to superintendents and teachers. Their sex desegregation program is directed to central office staff, then teachers, and then principals and the superintendent. Type D Institutes focus on the building level when delivering race desegregation assistance (teachers rank highest, followed by counselors, and then principals) and expand their focus to include the administrative level when delivering sex desegregation assistance (teachers again rank highest, followed by a tie between central office staff and principals, and then counselors). Like the GACs, the Type D TIs seem to experience greater contact with the administrative level when delivering sex desegregation services compared to the pattern evidenced in their race desegregation work.

In summary, the GACs and Type D TIs seem more organizationally comfortable than the SEAs in dealing with building level personnel when providing Title IV assistance. However, the legislated demands of Title IX necessitate extensive contact at the administrative level so that districts can meet the mandated deadlines. Consequently, their sex desegregation programs required modification of the district interaction patterns they had set up when delivering race desegregation assistance. The SEAs, as we pointed out last year, were already dealing with the administrative level in the district and consequently their method of service delivery did not require alteration.

In addition, we asked staff who were responsible for delivering both sex desegregation and race desegregation assistance to the sampled districts (approximately 40 percent of the respondents across project types) to compare the types of district interaction they experienced when delivering both types of assistance. Some interesting distinctions arise from these comparisons.

We first asked staff delivering both types of assistance to indicate whether district personnel participated more in planning their sex desegregation activities or their race desegregation activities. Table 49 summarizes their responses. (Note that the Type D TI responses are not included in this table. Only one Type D TI respondent felt that more participation had been received in either sex or race desegregation. All other Type D TI respondents felt district personnel had participated in planning their program to an equal degree.) The most interesting finding from this table is that the SEAs consistently perceive a higher level of district participation in their sex desegregation programs than in their race desegregation programs. We feel that this is a reflection of the nature of the activities the SEAs seem to feel most comfortable delivering. We found in last year's analysis that the SEAs often focused on technical assistance and informational activities. This was because of their previously established State Department of Education connection with the client school districts. The nature of Title IX legislation required immediate involvement with informational types of activities to help districts meet mandated deadlines. These deadlines were often administrative in na-

Table 49

REPORTED DISTRICT PARTICIPATION IN PLANNING DESEGREGATION ACTIVITIES[a]

Participant	GAC		SEA	
	Sex	Race	Sex	Race
District superintendent		x	x	
Central office staff		x	x	
School board		x	x	
Principals		x	x	
Teachers	x		x	
Counselors	x		x	

[a] x in column indicates more participation reported.

ture, requiring the development of some plan or administrative policy. This type of assistance seems to fit quite nicely with the organizational setup of the State Department and the expectations a school district would have concerning the activities of a unit in the State Department of Education. In fact, sex desegregation assistance seems to be more institutionally acceptable to the SEA client districts than race desegregation assistance. Nineteen percent of the SEA staff members experienced difficulty with districts not wanting any interference from the state in the area of race desegregation, while only 8 percent experienced such difficulty with sex desegregation assistance.

To carry this distinction further, staff were asked to indicate whether they felt personnel in the district they were serving were more supportive of sex desegregation or more supportive of race desegregation. This question was not designed to elicit responses geared toward the particular program the project offered to the district, but rather district support for the general area of sex discrimination and desegregation. Table 50 shows that once again the SEA staffs perceive their districts as consistently more supportive of sex desegregation than race desegregation. The Type D TI districts show the opposite pattern, with the staff reporting all levels of district personnel substantially more supportive of race desegregation. Table 43, which reported a district's stage of compliance with Title IX and school desegregation, provides an explanation for these patterns. Training Institutes are required to specify their client district(s) and the type of assistance proposed prior to funding. Type D TIs show by far the highest percentage of districts under court order to racially desegregate (50 percent compared to 26 percent for the SEAs and 16 percent for the GACs). Their districts have a clear-cut and immediate need for race desegregation assistance. The SEAs, on the other hand, show the largest percentage of districts never under court order and not voluntarily desegregating. As was suggested earlier, since the remedies being used to eliminate sex inequities in the schools contain the element of voluntarism, the public has been more accepting of sex desegregation than race desegregation and, therefore, it is not surprising that the SEA districts show less support for race desegregation.

Table 50

REPORTED DISTRICT SUPPORT OF SEX DESEGREGATION VERSUS RACE DESEGREGATION[a]

Supporter	GAC		SEA		Type D TI	
	Sex	Race	Sex	Race	Sex	Race
District superintendent		x	x			x
Central office staff		x	x			x
School board		x	x			x
Principals		x	x			x
Teachers		x	x			x
Counselors		x	x			x

[a]x in column indicates type of desegregation for which most support is perceived.

The GACs, unlike the SEAs, show more participation and support from the district in their race desegregation program. The two exceptions to this arise at the building level, where we see the GACs reporting more participation from teachers and counselors in their sex desegregation programs. We feel that this reflects the GACs' need to establish credibility in the new area of assistance. When GACs are actively involved in sex desegregation assistance, they often include training activities in their district program. Because the GACs would have no a priori knowledge about the sex desegregation needs of the building-level personnel, it is necessary to garner their participation in planning these new activities. However, we do see from Table 50 that the GACs consistently perceive more district support for their race desegregation programs. This is not surprising as their major focus continues to be race desegregation assistance.

To further monitor the effect of district interaction patterns on the activities undertaken by each project type, we decided to explore the relationship between targeting district personnel and undertaking the activities that make up our activity categories. Table 51 illustrates the results of this analysis.

We first notice that targeting different levels of district personnel is not significantly associated with undertaking certain types of sex desegregation activities. The one exception to this generalization is the association between the GACs' targeting central office administration and undertaking *Stage 1* activities. As we pointed out earlier, *Stage 1* activities are normally geared to the administrative level of the district so this relationship is not surprising. As for race desegregation activities, the TIs are the only project type that evidence significant associations between directing activities to all levels of a school district and undertaking certain kinds of activities. These relationships, however, are consistent with our previous analysis of the TIs. We found in last year's analysis that the TIs often served as in-house consultants to the district, and their operation was inextricably tied to the needs of their clients. Consequently, we would expect to find significant associations between targeting district personnel and undertaking certain activities.

The GACs, on the other hand, served their clients in a more autonomous fashion and we would not expect to find the same strong associations. And in fact Table 51 shows that while targeting district personnel is positively associated with undertaking particular activities, in only two cases were significant associations found.

The SEAs were pictured in our previous analysis as the project type least affected by their client districts. We had reported that in comparison to the GACs and TIs, SEAs rarely undertook training activities and instead focused their short-term assistance at the administrative level. And in fact we see that targeting the central office is negatively associated with undertaking *training*. However, SEAs that do undertake *training* tend to focus their activities at the building level.

To increase our understanding of the service delivery of Title IV projects, especially the potential distinction between sex desegregation programs and race desegregation programs, we asked the staff to indicate problems encountered in delivering their assistance. Table 52 shows whether the staff reported more implementation problems with their sex desegregation programs or with their race desegregation programs. This table shows that the GACs have difficulty gaining the confidence of the superintendent, getting appropriate personnel to participate, and finding personnel willing to devote time to GAC activities when delivering sex

Table 51

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN TARGETING DISTRICT PERSONNEL AND UNDERTAKING ACTIVITIES, BY ACTIVITY CATEGORY

Activity Category	Central Office Administration				Principal				Building Staff			
	GAC	SEA	Type D TI	Type S TI	GAC	SEA	Type D TI	Type S TI	GAC	SEA	Type D TI	Type S TI
Sex desegregation												
Stage 1	.476[a]	.276	.163	-.494	.302	.138	.327	.444	.098	.057	.327	-.543
Stage 2	.031	.316	.438	.198	-.062	.185	.375	-.148	.104	.199	.188	.444
Race desegregation												
Training	.226	-.484[b]	.720[b]		.223	.225	.613[b]		.182	.326[a]	.600[b]	
Programmatic	.117	.087	.214		.157	.167	.153		.142	.440[b]	.015	
Desegregation	.410[a]	-.039	.688[a]		.256	-.161	.604[a]		.287	.007	.583[a]	
Technical assistance	.070	.146	.440		.057	-.024	.667[b]		.356[a]	.058	.653[b]	

[a]Significant at the .05 level.

[b]Significant at the .01 level.

Table 52

IMPLEMENTATION PROBLEMS[a]

Problem	GAC		SEA		Type D TI	
	Sex	Race	Sex	Race	Sex	Race
Gaining confidence of superintendent/ administrator				x		x
Getting appropriate level of personnel to participate	x			x		x
Finding personnel willing to devote time	x			x		x
Keeping participants actively involved		x		x	x	
Delivering appropriate assistance	x			x		
Obtaining feedback from central office		x		x	x	
Communicating with participants after assistance ends		x		x	x	

[a] x in column indicates which desegregation activity faces more implementation problems.

desegregation assistance to a district. The GACs, unlike the SEAs, do not have an institutionally established entrée into their districts. Instead, GAC credibility and accessibility have been related to the content of its service which, in past years, was exclusively related to race desegregation. It is therefore not surprising that when faced with a new area of assistance, the GACs would experience difficulty gaining entry and initially creating interest in the program. A further distinction follows when one looks at the problems experienced by the GACs in their race desegregation programs. These problems relate to actual service delivery and not the planning thereof.

The SEAs, however, report implementation problems only in relation to their race desegregation programs. Since the SEAs are required to deal with all the districts in the state, yet report the highest percentage of client districts which are not racially desegregated, this is not surprising. Further, we have consistently seen that the SEAs show the highest involvement in sex desegregation activities when compared to the GACs or Type D TIs, especially involvement that is consistent with the pattern they evidence in their race desegregation programs. Since the institutional setting of the SEAs, as well as their established interaction pattern, orients them toward sex desegregation assistance, it is understandable why they would experience fewer sex related than race related implementation problems.

The Type D TIs experience the bulk of their implementation problems in their race desegregation programs. This probably reflects the fact that race desegregation assistance is the primary focus of the Type D TIs. The sex desegregation activities most frequently undertaken by Type D TIs are either of the "informational" variety, which would lead to few implementation problems, or are in training. The nature of their sex desegregation training, however, is apt to be more general and less controversial than their race desegregation training so, again, we would expect fewer implementation problems. Because TIs have already established their

roles in the districts, we would expect them to experience less difficulty than the GACs in establishing their credibility in a new area.

Table 53 illustrates the areas in which GACs, SEAs, and Type D TIs feel they are most effective. The GACs and Type D TIs feel their race desegregation program is most effective when they are training participants—usually at the building level. Their sex desegregation programs involve the administrative level of the district to a greater degree and they report effectiveness with that endeavor also. In fact, both the GACs and Type D TIs report a higher level of effectiveness in some aspects of both their sex and their race desegregation programs. The SEAs, on the other hand, report a higher level of effectiveness only in their sex desegregation programs, with one exception. Once again this is a clear indication of the SEAs' orientation toward sex desegregation assistance as being more consistent with the strengths of their organization.

Table 53

PROJECT EFFECTIVENESS IN THE DISTRICT[a]

Area of Effectiveness	GAC		SEA		Type D TI	
	Sex	Race	Sex	Race	Sex	Race
District change in personnel selection	x		x			
District change in pupil placement	x		x		x	
Participant use of new materials		x	x			x
Participant use of new methods/ procedures		x		x		x
Change in course content by participants		x	x			x
Changed participant attitude		x	x		x	
District change of program/policies	x		x			x

[a]x in column indicates which desegregation program is perceived to be more effective.

The next set of tables presents the relationship between implementation problems and effectiveness with activities and certain district interaction patterns. Initially, we were interested in determining the relationship between implementation problems and undertaking activities. We did not find any statistically significant or even strong associations, however. We then tested the relationship between reporting effectiveness and undertaking activities. Table 54 reports the results.

We see that reporting effectiveness is significantly associated with the GACs' undertaking *Stage 1* sex desegregation activities and the SEAs' undertaking *Stage 2* activities. We presented information previously indicating that GACs view their sex desegregation programs as ancillary to their primary thrust—race desegregation. The SEAs, however, show the opposite thrust. Consequently, it is not surprising to find that GACs report effectiveness in their sex desegregation activities only when undertaking *Stage 1* activities, since their major thrust in this first year of offering sex desegregation assistance would be minimally geared to meeting the mandated deadlines of Title IX. It is also not surprising to find SEAs going beyond

Table 54

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN REPORTING EFFECTIVENESS AND UNDERTAKING ACTIVITIES, BY ACTIVITY CATEGORY

Activity Category	GAC	SEA	Type D TI	Type S TI
Sex desegregation				
Stage 1	.686[a]	.281	.082	-.543
Stage 2	.249	.707[a]	.313	.049
Race desegregation				
Training	.163	.261	.347	
Programmatic	.328[b]	.226	.842[a]	
Desegregation	.041	.249	.313	
Technical assistance	.237	.185	.200	

[a]Significant at the .01 level.

[b]Significant at the .05 level.

this preliminary assistance into *Stage 2* activities when they feel particularly effective in a district.

As for race desegregation assistance, we find that all project types show positive associations between reporting effectiveness and undertaking activities. We also find that the GACs and Type D TIs show significant associations between reporting effectiveness and undertaking *programmatic* activities. The activities that make up our *programmatic* category (instructional techniques, curricula development, administrative procedures) require district interest to be implemented. Table 53 indicated that both the GACs and Type D TIs felt effective in getting participants to use new materials, new methods and procedures, and changing course content, all of which relate to the activities comprised by our *programmatic* activity category.

Table 55 illustrates the relationship between reporting district support and experiencing implementation problems. We expected greater district support to be associated with fewer implementation problems and found our assumptions substantiated. All projects report a negative association between district support and experiencing implementation problems (with the exception of the Type D TIs, which essentially experience no relationship between district support and implementation problems in their sex desegregation programs).

The data in Table 56 show the relationship between reporting district support and reporting project effectiveness in their activity program. In this case we expected a positive association between district support and reporting effectiveness. Again we find that the correlations substantiate our hypothesis. All project types evidence strong and in several cases statistically significant associations between district support and project effectiveness. These data lend support to our findings from last year, which showed that an amenable district environment was a necessary condition if TIs were to have a positive impact at the district level and was a contributing factor to the perceived impact of the GACs at the district level. On the other hand, last year we found district amenability to be unimportant for the SEAs, whereas these data suggest that district amenability, in terms of the support districts give the Title IV SEAs, is important to the SEAs' effectiveness. However,

Table 55

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN REPORTING DISTRICT SUPPORT FOR TITLE IV PROGRAM AND IMPLEMENTATION PROBLEMS

Implementation Problem Area	GAC	SEA	Type D TI	Type S TI
Sex desegregation program	-.101	-.148	.069	-.328
Race desegregation program	-.370[a]	-.131	-.218	

[a]Significant at the .01 level.

Table 56

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN REPORTING DISTRICT SUPPORT FOR TITLE IV PROGRAM AND PROJECT EFFECTIVENESS

Area of Effectiveness	GAC	SEA	Type D TI	Type S TI
Sex desegregation program	.513[a]	.417[b]	.537[c]	.463
Race desegregation program	.217	.278[c]	.519[b]	

[a]Significant at the .001 level.

[b]Significant at the .01 level.

[c]Significant at the .05 level.

as we shall see later when we analyze the responses to a question that deals more directly with district amenability, the SEA programs are still influenced less by the amenability of the district than are the programs of the GACs and TIs.

We were also interested in determining the relationship between district participation in planning project activities and project assessment of their effectiveness. Specifically, we were interested in determining the effect of greater district participation in planning race desegregation activities than sex desegregation activities on project effectiveness. We expected a negative association with their sex desegregation program and a positive association with their race desegregation program. The SEAs and Type D TIs evidenced negative associations with their sex desegregation programs, while the GACs showed no relationship. However, an unexpected association showed up with the Type D TIs and their effectiveness in their race desegregation programs. We found a significant negative association between more participation in planning the TIs' race desegregation programs and reporting race desegregation effectiveness (−.707, significant at the .05 level). However, recalling that the data in Sec. V indicated that the more autonomous the TI,

the fewer planning problems it experienced, this insight serves to explain this negative association. We feel that extensive district participation in the Type D TIs race desegregation programs is seen as district meddling and serves to undermine the TIs' confidence and, therefore, their perceived effectiveness.

Finally, we come to the important issue of district amenability. We posited in our previous analysis that district amenability was a critical variable in Title IV success. To test this hypothesis we looked at the relationship between district amenability and undertaking the activities that make up our categories. We found the expected relationships: District amenability to sex desegregation was positively associated with the GACs' and Type D TIs' undertaking sex desegregation activities more frequently. Additionally, we found similarly positive associations between district amenability to school desegregation and GACs' and Type D TIs' undertaking race desegregation activities more frequently. The SEAs, as expected, did not show any strong associations between district amenability and activities.

In our previous study we found district amenability to be more critical for the service delivery of GACs and Type D TIs than for SEAs. Instead, the critical variable for the SEAs was the amenability of the host institution. When the State Department was perceived as amenable, SEAs were able to work more effectively with all districts in their state, including those which were more resistant to school desegregation. Our data this year support that earlier finding and are consistent for both the SEAs' race and sex desegregation programs.

Table 57 reports the relationship between district amenability and reported effectiveness in Title IV activities. We again see the expected results. Both GACs and Type D TIs, which are more organizationally tied to their client districts than the SEAs, show positive (and in some cases statistically significant) associations between district amenability and project effectiveness.

Table 57

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN DISTRICT AMENABILITY AND EFFECTIVENESS

Area of Effectiveness	GAC	SEA	Type D TI	Type S TI
Sex desegregation program	.303[a]	.159	.373	.608
Race desegregation program	.268[a]	.140	.456[a]	

[a]Significant at the .05 level.

SUMMARY

In summary, we have shown that the district interaction patterns for the Title IV project types are similar to those evidenced last year. However, the addition of sex desegregation responsibilities has resulted in a modification of this pattern for the GACs and Type D TIs: This year they are interacting more frequently with the

administrative level of the district. We suggest that this modification results because Title IX mandates activities that need to be undertaken with the administrative level of the schooi district. Concurrently, we found that the SEAs, which had already established an ongoing interaction pattern with the administrative level in terms of their race desegregation programs, were able to include sex desegregation activities without altering their service delivery approach.

VII. FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

In the previous chapters we saw that GACs, SEAs, and Type D Institutes operate in a distinct fashion from one another in delivering desegregation assistance. Furthermore, we examined the ways in which the addition of sex desegregation responsibilities has resulted in modifications by these Title IV projects of their race desegregation service delivery. Finally, we compared the sex desegregation program offered by these three Title IV project offices as well as by the project office that was created this year for the sole purpose of delivering sex desegregation assistance—the Type S TI. In this chapter we will briefly summarize our findings, provide additional evidence to support these findings, and suggest ways in which the Office of Education might strengthen the Title IV program by capitalizing on the strengths of these Title IV project types.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Of the three Title IV projects in existence prior to this year, SEAs are undertaking sex desegregation assistance to a greater extent than are GACs and Type D Institutes. We posit that this has occurred for a number of different reasons. First, their approach to delivering racial desegregation services is highly compatible with the approach needed to deliver first-year sex desegregation services—both in terms of types of activities offered and district personnel to whom these services are directed. Second, since SEAs serve all districts in their state, including districts which may have no need for race desegregation services or may be resistant to school desegregation, the demand of their clients for sex desegregation assistance is apt to be greater than for race desegregation assistance. Third, SEAs perceive more support for their services in the area of sex desegregation than race desegregation, both from their own host institution and from their client districts. Thus, in the case of the SEAs, the addition of sex desegregation responsibilities to their prior race desegregation responsibilities has afforded them the opportunity to expand their services into an area for which there is both support and demand, without putting a strain on their organization. The SEAs in small northern states, where there is less demand for their race desegregation services, have found a receptive (and captive) audience for sex desegregation services. State Education Agencies in larger northern and southern states have found sex desegregation activities, most notably *Stage I* activities, to be compatible with the race desegregation services they were already providing—*desegregation* and *technical assistance*.

General Assistance Centers, on the other hand, are not undertaking sex desegregation activities to as great an extent as are the SEAs, and we feel this is because the sex desegregation services required during this first year were less compatible with the GACs' race desegregation programs. For example, during 1975-1976, districts were required to undertake and complete certain activities to comply with Title IX. We labeled the assistance given districts with these activities as Title IV *Stage I* activities. These *Stage I* activities are most similar to the types of desegregation activities labeled *technical assistance*. Undertaking *Stage I* activities re-

quires imparting information to the districts regarding Title IX and working with the administration to formulate and enact new policies to eliminate sex related inequities. But GACs generally undertake *technical assistance* to a less extent than do SEAs. Therefore, frequently undertaking *Stage 1* activities would create a shift in the service delivery pattern of GACs. We in fact found this to be the case. General Assistance Centers primarily undertake *training* and *programmatic* kinds of race desegregation assistance. Although GACs that frequently undertake sex desegregation services continue to frequently undertake *programmatic* activities, they are much less apt to undertake *training*. Furthermore, undertaking sex desegregation activities requires GACs to target the administrative level more frequently than when delivering their race desegregation assistance. Finally, the organizational characteristics of GACs inhibit their undertaking sex desegregation assistance to any great extent. Not only do GACs experience the least staff turnover and, therefore, the least opportunity to bring in staff specialized in the area of sex discrimination, but they are also more likely than the SEAs to have developed an ongoing program of race desegregation assistance. Therefore, GACs have less flexibility than SEAs to undertake services in an entirely new field. In fact, we have seen that GACs that work with a small number of districts are undertaking very few sex desegregation activities as compared to GACs that work with large numbers of districts. We posit that these small GACs have developed programs that are very specific to the school desegregation needs of these few districts, whereas the larger GAC's are operating more as general, all-purpose service agencies. The programs of these larger GACs are less apt to be highly specified and, therefore, sex desegregation activities could more easily be adapted to them.

Training Institutes are also more apt to have established race desegregation programs, geared to the specific needs of the districts they serve. Therefore, they too will not have the flexibility to substantially alter their programs to include sex desegregation services. Type D Institutes appear to undertake sex desegregation services less frequently than any of the other project types. Also, we have seen that when they do undertake sex desegregation work, they do so by extensively piggybacking it onto their race desegregation work. Thus, the sex desegregation activities undertaken by Type D TIs are consistent with the race desegregation activities they most frequently undertake: *training* and *programmatic* assistance. Type D TIs are more apt to undertake *Stage 2* activities than *Stage 1* activities, since these second-stage activities are more congruent with their ongoing race desegregation programs. *Stage 2* sex desegregation activities include curricula development and providing building-level staff with new techniques. Furthermore, we have seen that undertaking *Stage 1* activities leads to a modification of the Type D Institutes' service delivery approach, since *Stage 1* activities are directed to the administrative level of a district to a much greater extent than are the activities normally undertaken by a Desegregation Institute.

Type S Institutes report undertaking sex desegregation activities to a much greater extent than any of the other three Title IV project types, which is to be expected given that that is their sole focus. Additionally, they are more apt to be frequently undertaking *Stage 1* activities than *Stage 2* activities. Since districts would have an immediate need for *Stage 1* assistance, we posit that Type S Institutes can use the provision of these services as a means of gaining entry into the districts. Even so, Type S Institutes are experiencing strain and other problems, which we feel can be explained by their newness as a Title IV project.

SUPPORTING EVIDENCE

Without the benefit of having site-visited any Institutes this year, throughout this report we have had to interpret the findings for the Type S Institutes based on our knowledge of the Desegregation Institutes from our site visits in the previous study. Where these findings were inconsistent with our expectations, two interpretations were possible: (1) Type S Institutes are somehow different from Type D Institutes, or (2) this inconsistency occurred because the Type S Institutes were newly funded projects this year. In a further effort to determine which of these two interpretations is correct, we compared Type D Institutes that were newly funded this year to those that had been funded last year, and to Type S Institutes, on a number of selected variables. As the data in Table 58 illustrate, newly funded Type D TIs report a greater incidence of problems than do continuously funded Type D TIs. In fact, only newly funded Type D TIs experience problems in implementing their race desegregation programs. They also report much less effectiveness in their race desegregation programs than do the continuously funded Desegregation Institutes. (The association between experiencing implementation problems in race desegregation and perceived effectiveness in race desegregation is −.446, significant at the .05 level.) However, although there were an equal number of continuously funded and newly funded Desegregation Institutes undertaking sex desegregation assistance (4 each), the newly funded Type D Institutes report greater effectiveness in sex desegregation than do the continuously funded Institutes. Newly funded Type D Institutes may be more effective in sex desegregation because they are able to design their sex desegregation programs to closely meet the needs of their districts. Continuously funded Institutes, however, probably undertake only those sex desegregation activities that are compatible with their ongoing race desegregation programs. At any rate, these data clearly confirm the fact that newly funded Institutes experience greater problems than Institutes that were funded last year.

Comparing newly funded Type D Institutes with Type S Institutes, however, showed that there are further differences between these two project types. For example, in terms of staffing problems, both the newly funded Type D and Type S Institutes report uncertainty of funding as their greatest problem. However, the

Table 58

COMPARISON OF PROBLEMS OF NEWLY FUNDED AND CONTINUOUSLY FUNDED TYPE D INSTITUTES

Problem	Percent More Frequently Reported by Newly Funded Than by Continuously Funded Type D TIs
Staffing problems	86
Planning problems	89
Implementation problems	
Race desegregation	100
Sex desegregation	86
Effectiveness	
Race desegregation	14
Sex desegregation	72

problem cited next most frequently by the Type D Institutes was their inability to offer competitive salaries (33 percent), whereas for the Type S Institutes the second-ranked problems were the inability to find qualified staff and the lengthy start-up time needed to train new staff (both 44 percent). This is a clear indication that Type S Institutes may be experiencing staffing problems unique to the area of sex desegregation.

Similar differences occur when we compare the responses of newly funded Type D Institutes and Type S Institutes about problems in planning their programs. Both cite district schedules and the need to tailor programs to different levels of district personnel as frequently experienced problems. However, Type D Institutes cite the changing needs of districts (67 percent), legal complications (44 percent), and the large number of districts served (44 percent) as their next most frequently experienced planning problems. In contrast, Type S Institutes cite as their next most frequent problems having to provide diverse activities (37 percent) and contacting the appropriate district personnel (34 percent). The problems cited by the Type S Institutes seem to relate to the initial development of their programs and in gaining access to the district. The problems cited by Type D Institutes, on the other hand, do not appear to relate to development or access, but rather are problems that occur to an already developed program. These distinctions become even clearer when a comparison is made of the implementation problems cited by these two types of Institutes. The implementation problems cited most frequently by Type S Institutes are in access to the district: communicating with participants after the training ends (27 percent) and gaining the confidence of the district administration (25 percent). In contrast, the implementation problem cited most frequently by newly funded Type D Institutes for both their sex and race desegregation programs was getting the appropriate level of personnel to participate. Thus, we see that for the Institutes, the number of years of funding as well as the focus of the project have an effect on the problems they are experiencing.

It was not possible to undertake the same analysis with GACs and SEAs, since very few of these projects are newly funded. However, as the data in Table 59 illustrate, there is a difference in the extent to which GACs and SEAs experience problems while trying to implement their sex and race desegregation programs. In general, SEAs experience more implementation problems than do GACs and more problems in implementing their race desegregation programs than their sex desegregation programs. General Assistance Centers, on the other hand, experience some problems more frequently when implementing their race desegregation programs and others when implementing their sex desegregation programs. The problems experienced when implementing their sex desegregation programs appear to be related to establishing the credibility of that program.

Table 60 provides further evidence of the uniqueness of the four Title IV project types. We asked project staff whether

they were undertaking certain types of assistance in the area of race and sex desegregation. Their responses show that Type S Institutes are undertaking assistance in these four specific areas more frequently than any of the other project types. Additionally, SEAs are undertaking assistance in these areas more frequently as part of their sex desegregation programs than their race desegregation programs, while the reverse is generally true for the Type D Institutes and GACs. Furthermore, we once again see that GACs and Type D Institutes focus primarily

Table 59

GAC AND SEA IMPLEMENTATION PROBLEMS

Problem	Percent Reporting "Almost Always" or "Frequently"			
	GAC		SEA	
	Sex	Race	Sex	Race
Gaining confidence of district administration	0	0	11	18
Getting appropriate personnel to participate	16	14	14	23
Getting personnel to devote necessary time and effort	21	8	26	28
Keeping participants actively involved	3	5	15	30
Delivering appropriate assistance	10	3	0	11
Obtaining feedback from central office staff	3	8	10	13
Communicating with participants after assistance ends	16	19	8	21

Table 60

AREAS IN WHICH DISTRICTS ARE ASSISTED, BY PROJECT TYPE AND PROGRAM

Area	Percent Responding That Assistance Provided						
	GAC		SEA		Type D TI		Type S TI
	Sex	Race	Sex	Race	Sex	Race	Sex
Personnel changes	13	30	62	49	26	25	67
District policies	59	51	76	70	34	37	79
Training	79	87	86	82	58	88	92
Attitude change	87	94	90	79	53	94	100

on training and human relations assistance, whereas SEAs are more apt to undertake a broader range of activities including those aimed at changing district policies.

Table 61 illustrates the extent to which the staff members who reported undertaking these types of assistance perceive themselves to be effective. We note that SEAs feel they are more effective in all areas of their sex desegregation programs than their race desegregation programs, whereas Type D Institutes report more effectiveness with their race desegregation programs than their sex desegregation programs. This supports our findings that SEAs evidence the least amount of organizational strain in delivering sex desegregation services, and that for Type D TIs, sex desegregation is ancillary to their race desegregation efforts. Furthermore,

Table 61

AREAS OF EFFECTIVENESS, BY PROJECT TYPE AND PROGRAM

Area	Percent Responding "Very Effective" and "Effective"						
	GAC		SEA		Type D TI		Type S TI
	Sex	Race	Sex	Race	Sex	Race	Sex
Personnel changes	46	36	48	36	0	0	50
District policies	67	50	59	40	25	33	58
Training	55	60	62	50	55	83	69
Attitude changes	54	53	61	38	0	53	39

we note that Type S Institutes perceive themselves to be less effective in changing attitudes than in any other area. However, it seems that a necessary precondition for effecting attitude change is for the recipient of such change efforts to respect the knowledge and sensitivity of the change agent. It is possible that Type S Institutes are less effective in this area because they are still in the process of establishing their credibility in this new area of Title IV assistance.

General Assistance Centers are really anomalous. In general, they report greater effectiveness in sex desegregation than race desegregation, with the exception of training. However, the type of assistance that shows the largest discrepancy is getting districts to change their policies. Given the mandated deadlines in the Title IX legislation, it is not surprising to find GACs more effective in this part of their sex desegregation programs. Their client districts have a built-in incentive for changing their policies that impedes sexual equality. This legislated incentive does not exist in district school desegregation policies.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Although the basis for our analysis has been a comparison of the different Title IV projects as distinct and separate entities, in making program recommendations we need to consider the Title IV program as a whole and the collective needs of the school districts within a state or region. In any given state or region there are apt to be districts in varying need of sex desegregation and race desegregation assistance. These needs can best be met by a certain mix of Title IV projects, which will also vary from state to state and region to region. Thus, although the recommendations that follow are made on a project-by-project basis, they are offered in the spirit of maximizing an integrated approach to Title IV assistance.

State Education Agencies

State Education Agencies are undertaking sex desegregation work more frequently than any of the other project types that existed prior to this year. In addition, we have shown sex desegregation assistance to be compatible with the race desegregation program of the SEAs, both in terms of service delivery approach and types of activities offered. The SEAs' race desegregation programs are focused

more on *technical assistance* and *desegregation* than are any of the other project types. In some respects, both of these activity categories can be considered first-stage technical assistance for racially desegregating school districts. The SEAs provide these districts with needed information, help them to plan their desegregation programs, and help them to resolve problems as they occur. From our previous study we know that SEAs are especially effective at these types of activities. *Stage 1* sex desegregation activities, which are necessary first steps for districts to undertake toward alleviating sex inequities, are similar in nature to the desegregation activities already being undertaken by SEAs. And we know from self-reports that they feel they are being effective in this area, too. In our judgment the addition of sex desegregation responsibilities to the desegregation responsibilities of SEAs has enabled them to expand their programs in the areas in which they feel most effective and can hopefully have the most district-level impact.

Furthermore, SEAs serve the largest number of districts. In fact, they are the only project type that is apt to be serving all of the school districts in a state. As we noted earlier, these districts are apt to be in varying stages with respect to desegregation and sex discrimination. State Education Agencies are the most likely agencies from which these districts can obtain needed information and short-term assistance, first, by virtue of their connection to the State Department of Education, and second, because they can provide assistance to a school district at any time without a prior invitation. Therefore, we feel that SEAs provide the greatest opportunity for Title IV to reach the maximum number of districts and to provide short-term assistance. Also, since SEAs usually communicate with the greatest number of districts, they are in the best position of any Title IV project type to serve as a referral agency. State Education Agencies could refer districts in need of more in-depth assistance to the GACs or Institutes serving those areas. Therefore, our recommendations for SEAs are as follows:

- *State Education Agencies should be encouraged to provide* first-stage *assistance to districts in both race and sex desegregation.*
- *State Education Agencies are organizationally more capable than other Title IV projects of delivering short-term, blanket assistance. Therefore, SEAs should continue to assist all districts in their state without being required to have a prior written invitation.*
- *State Education Agencies should be encouraged to remain current concerning other Title IV projects in their state and the services provided by these projects, and should serve as referral agencies to other Title IV projects for districts in need of more in-depth assistance.*

General Assistance Centers

In some respects GACs demonstrate the greatest variance as a project type. General Assistance Centers range from those that are highly focused, primarily delivering very district-specific race desegregation activities to a small number of districts, to those that are more general, all-purpose agencies serving a large number of districts. The latter kind of GACs in effect become more like SEAs: they more frequently undertake *Stage 1* sex desegregation activities and *technical assistance* desegregation activities than smaller GACs. The biggest distinction between GACs serving large numbers of districts and SEAs is that the GACs extensively under-

take *programmatic* activities whereas the SEAs do not. This is understandable, since GACs are located at universities which normally undertake curricula development. In fact, our data show that GACs are most effective when they undertake *training* and *programmatic* types of assistance. However, our data also show that the larger the proportion of project resources spent on sex desegregation work, the less likely GACs are to frequently undertake *training* and *programmatic* assistance. Also, the larger the number of districts served, the less likely GACs are to frequently undertake *training*. In fact, *training* generally appears to be a district-specific type of activity, targeted primarily to the building level. When GACs are constrained from operating in a district-specific fashion, by virtue of the number of districts they serve, the size of their staffs, or the frequency with which they undertake other, non-district-specific activities, they undertake *training* less frequently. Therefore, our recommendations for GACs are as follows:

- *The best combination of desegregation activities for GACs to undertake is both* training *and* programmatic.

However, since there is a relationship between the extent to which GACs undertake these activities and other characteristics, we also make the following recommendations:

- *Quantitative statistical criteria should be deemphasized for GACs so that they are not forced into serving so many districts that they are prevented from working with some of them on an individual basis.*
- *Because GACs have close connections to the education departments of their host universities, which are tied into curriculum development, they are more institutionally capable of providing programmatic assistance to a large number of school districts than are any other Title IV projects. However, GACs should be encouraged to combine these blanket programmatic services with other services that are more district-specific.*
- *GACs should be encouraged to work with districts in later stages of race and sex desegregation for two reasons: (1)* Stage 2 *sex desegregation activities are more compatible with GACs' ongoing race desegregation programs and the mix of desegregation activities recommended for GACs, and (2) SEAs are better equipped organizationally to meet the first-stage needs of the districts with respect to race and sex desegregation services.*

Training Institutes

Training Institutes serve a different purpose than GACs and SEAs; they are intended to provide in-depth assistance to a few districts in need of such assistance. Consequently, it has been the practice of Title IV to award TI grants to universities or colleges located near the districts that are to receive this in-depth service. As a result, TIs are generally not funded for more than one year at a time. However, our data show Institutes with continuous funding to be more effective and to experience fewer organizational and implementation problems than newly funded Institutes. Therefore, our recommendation for all Training Institutes is as follows:

- *Either multiple-year funding for Training Institutes should be considered or additional point award criteria should be added for project proposals that reflect sound project organization.*

Type D Institutes

Eight of the 14 responding Desegregation Institutes are undertaking sex desegregation services in addition to their race desegregation work. However, our data clearly show that race desegregation assistance remains the primary focus of these Institutes. The sex desegregation work that they do undertake is extensively piggybacked onto their race desegregation programs, and we have no evidence that undertaking sex desegregation work impedes the effectiveness of these Institutes in offering race desegregation assistance. Therefore, our recommendation for Type D Institutes is as follows:

- *Sex desegregation should remain an optional activity for Type D Institutes.*

Type S Institutes

In addition to the problems experienced by Type S Institutes that can be attributable to their newness as a Title IV project, Type S Institutes also show evidence of experiencing problems that are unique to them. First, they appear to be experiencing unique problems with respect to staffing (finding qualified staff and the lengthy time needed to train staff). We posit that this is because sex-desegregation is a relatively new field with few people trained in this area. Second, Type S Institutes appear to be experiencing problems establishing credibility with the districts. Since newly funded Type D Institutes are not experiencing the same problems, we initially assumed that the problem was caused by the different foci of these two project offices—sex desegregation versus race desegregation. However, SEAs are also not experiencing the same types of problems as Type S Institutes and SEAs are heavily involved in sex desegregation work. There is, however, a critical difference between SEAs and Type S Institutes—their staff. The SEA directors are primarily male and their staffs are 50 percent male. Type S Institute directors are all female and their staffs are 80 percent female. However, the administrative level of most client school districts is predominantly male and we know that approximately two-thirds of the Type S TIs use an administrator other than the Title IX coordinator (who is apt to be female) as their contact person in the district. Furthermore, we know that *Stage 1* sex desegregation activities are directed to this administrative level and that Type S Institutes undertake *Stage 1* activities more frequently than *Stage 2* activities partially as a means (we posited) of gaining entry into the district. It is quite possible that this preponderantly male administrative level is having difficulty accepting assistance from a preponderantly female project. If this is the case, then we might expect Type S Institutes to experience fewer problems in implementing *Stage 2* sex desegregation activities, which are targeted to the building level, and predominately female, staff. Our data show this to be the case. Frequently undertaking *Stage 1* activities is correlated with experiencing more implementation problems (.688), whereas frequently undertaking *Stage 2* activities is correlated with fewer implementation problems (−.188). Therefore, our recommendations for the Type S Institutes are as follows:

- *EEOP should sponsor a training conference for Type S Institute directors and staff, to assist them with the initial training of their staff.*

- *Type S Institutes should be encouraged to undertake* Stage 2 *activities.*
- *Type S Institutes should be encouraged to use the district Title IX coordinator as their contact person rather than other district administrators.*

REGIONAL OFFICES

Although the Title IV regional offices were not a focus of this year's study, taking an integrated approach to Title IV assistance has implications for the regional offices as well. As we have stated, in any given region or area the needs of the districts will vary with respect to race and sex desegregation. We feel that the present mix of Title IV projects allows these varying district needs to be met *provided these needs are considered in their entirety at the time Title IV funding decisions are made.* For example, our data show that in some densely populated northern states GACs are undertaking primarily race desegregation assistance. This could leave a sex desegregation assistance void in those states. If these districts are all in the first stages of sex desegregation *and* the SEA in that state is serving all of the districts, then the sex desegregation needs of these districts are probably being met. However, if the SEA is not serving all the districts in that state or if there are some districts that could benefit

from more in-depth sex desegregation assistance, then the districts' needs will not be adequately met unless the SEA is directed to broaden the scope of its services or some Type S Institutes are funded. Therefore, our recommendation for the regional office is as follows:

- *When funding Title IV projects, the regional office should look at the overall needs of the region in Civil Rights related technical assistance. The regional office should attempt to assure that some of both types of desegregation assistance will be available to districts in need of such help.*

FEDERAL EQUAL EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY PROGRAM

We feel it would be remiss not to point out a potential problem: In the near future when school districts have complied with the first-stage requirements of Title IX and are in need of services aimed at changing the more subtle kinds of sexist behaviors and attitudes, they may not have their needs met through the Title IV program as it presently operates. Presently, SEAs show a predilection to undertake *Stage 1* rather than *Stage 2* activities, and GACs, whose service delivery approach is more compatible with undertaking *Stage 2* activities, show little commitment to do so. Additionally, both types of TIs work with too few districts to adequately meet the needs of a large number of school districts for these types of sex desegregation services. Therefore, our recommendation to USOE is as follows:

- *The USOE should include incentives in the Title IV program regulations to increase project commitment to undertake* Stage 2 *sex desegregation activities. While we do not feel prepared at this time to make specific recommendations conerning the form these incentives should take, we do feel it is a potentially serious problem warranting USOE's attention.*

CONCLUDING REMARKS

The Title IV program was established to provide distinct types of school desegregation services to districts in need of such service. This year Title IV projects have been given the additional responsibility of providing sex desegregation services. Our study has found that even with the provision of these two types of assistance, there is still a distinct variation in what each project type does well. We feel that it would be inappropriate for Title IV to try to homogenize these project types. Rather, the program should seek to maximize the strengths of each organization in providing integrated services to school districts. We hope that our suggestions will aid the program in moving toward this goal.

Appendix A

SPECIMENS OF PRELIMINARY SCREENING FORMS AND SAMPLING FORM TO PROJECT DIRECTORS

Name of General Assistance Center _____

PLEASE RETURN THIS FORM WHETHER YOUR PROJECT IS INVOLVED IN SEX DISCRIMINATION ASSISTANCE OR NOT.

Is your Title IV-sponsored General Assistance Center involved in activities related to sex discrimination during this program year? Please check as many of the following as are applicable:

☐ 1) *No* - No plans to deliver sex discrimination assistance to any school district.

☐ 2) *Yes* - Assistance to school districts is planned but no implementation dates are scheduled yet.

☐ 3) *Yes* - Assistance is planned and implementation dates are scheduled in some school districts.

☐ 4) *Yes* - Assistance is now being delivered to some school districts.

☐ 5) *Yes* - Assistance has been delivered to some school districts during this program year.

If you checked "1" or "2" only, please omit the remainder of this form and return it to us. If you checked any combination of 3, 4, or 5, please complete the attached page and return both pages to us. Please give preference in your listing to any districts in which services will be delivered by March 1, 1976. *Thank you!*

After listing up to 8 districts in the left-hand column of the form below, please provide the information requested for each district.

Up to 8 Districts Receiving the Most Title IV Assistance in Sex Discrimination

District Name	Major Sex Discrimination Activity Regarding Title IX Now in Progress or Planned	Date Assistance Delivered or Planned	Does District Also Receive Desegregation Assistance? (Yes or No)	Is this the First Year You Have Provided Any Title IV Assistance for District? (Yes or No)	Name of District Contact Person
1)					
2)					
3)					
4)					
5)					
6)					
7)					
8)					

Please return both forms in the enclosed pre-addressed envelope by February 15, 1976. *Thank you!*

Name of State Education Agency _____

PLEASE RETURN THIS FORM WHETHER YOUR PROJECT IS INVOLVED IN SEX DISCRIMINATION ASSISTANCE OR NOT.

Is your Title IV-sponsored State Education Agency involved in activities related to sex discrimination during this program year? Please check as many of the following as are applicable:

- ☐ 1) *No* - No plans to deliver sex discrimination assistance to any school district.
- ☐ 2) *Yes* - Assistance to school districts is planned but no implementation dates are scheduled yet.
- ☐ 3) *Yes* - Assistance is planned and implementation dates are scheduled in some school districts.
- ☐ 4) *Yes* - Assistance is now being delivered to some school districts.
- ☐ 5) *Yes* - Assistance has been delivered to some school districts during this program year.

If you checked "1" or "2" only, please omit the remainder of this form and return it to us. If you checked any combination of 3, 4, or 5, please complete the attached page and return both pages to us. Please give preference in your listing to any districts in which services will be delivered by March 1, 1976. *Thank you!*

After listing up to 8 districts in the left-hand column of the form below, please provide the information requested for each district.

Up to 8 Districts Receiving the Most Title IV Assistance in Sex Discrimination

District Name	Major Sex Discrimination Activity Regarding Title IX Now in Progress or Planned	Date Assistance Delivered or Planned	Does District Also Receive Desegregation Assistance? (Yes or No)	Is This the First Year You Have Provided Any Title IV Assistance for District? (Yes or No)	Name of District Contact Person
1)					
2)					
3)					
4)					
5)					
6)					
7)					
8)					

Please return both forms in the enclosed pre-addressed envelope by February 15, 1976. *Thank you!*

Type D Institutes

SELECTING TWO DISTRICTS FOR QUESTIONNAIRE USE

Please list in alphabetical order the names of all school districts receiving sex-discrimination assistance during fiscal year 1975.

1. _____
2. _____
3. _____
4. _____
5. _____
6. _____
7. _____
8. _____
9. _____
10. _____

A. If there is only one district, please write the name of that district on the first page of one staff member questionnaire (or two questionnaires, if appropriate - see Rand letter), and distribute it to the appropriate staff person. You may destroy the three (two) extra questionnaires.

B. If there are only two districts, please write the names of those two districts, one in each questionnaire, on the first page of one staff member questionnaire (or two questionnaires, if appropriate - see Rand letter) for each district.

C. If there are three or more districts: Circle the number opposite the total number of districts listed above; then go to the random selection table below and circle that same number in the first left-hand column of numbers.

IF THE TOTAL NUMBER OF DISTRICTS IS:
IF THE TOTAL NUMBER OF DISTRICTS IS:
IF THE TOTAL NUMBER OF DISTRICTS IS:
IF THE TOTAL NUMBER OF DISTRICTS IS:
IF THE TOTAL NUMBER OF DISTRICTS IS:
IF THE TOTAL NUMBER OF DISTRICTS IS:
IF THE TOTAL NUMBER OF DISTRICTS IS:
IF THE TOTAL NUMBER OF DISTRICTS IS:

Please write the names of those two districts selected on questionnaires according to the instruction in section B above.

Please inform your staff members that the district referred to throughout the parts of their questionnaire is that one district written on the first page. Thank you.

Type S Institutes

SELECTING TWO DISTRICTS FOR QUESTIONNAIRE USE

Please list in alphabetical order the names of all school districts receiving sex-discrimination assistance during fiscal year 1975.

1. _____
2. _____
3. _____
4. _____
5. _____
6. _____
7. _____
8. _____
9. _____
10. _____

A. If there is only one district, please write the name of that district on the first page of one staff member questionnaire, and distribute it to the appropriate staff person. You may destroy the extra questionnaire.

B. If there are only two districts, please write the names of those two districts, one in each questionnaire, on the first page of one staff member questionnaire for each district.

C. If there are three or more districts: Circle the number opposite the total number of districts listed above; then go to the random selection table below and circle that same number in the first left-hand column of numbers.

IF THE TOTAL NUMBER OF DISTRICTS IS:
IF THE TOTAL NUMBER OF DISTRICTS IS:
IF THE TOTAL NUMBER OF DISTRICTS IS:
IF THE TOTAL NUMBER OF DISTRICTS IS:
IF THE TOTAL NUMBER OF DISTRICTS IS:
IF THE TOTAL NUMBER OF DISTRICTS IS:
IF THE TOTAL NUMBER OF DISTRICTS IS:
IF THE TOTAL NUMBER OF DISTRICTS IS:

Please write the names of those two districts selected on questionnaires according to the instructions in section B above.

Please inform your staff members that the district referred to throughout the parts of their questionnaire is that one district written on the first page. Thank you.

Appendix B

SAMPLE SELECTION

PROJECT OFFICE SAMPLE

The sampling plan for this year's study attempted to capitalize on the previous year's learning and enhance data comparability by concentrating field visits on GACs and SEAs visited previously. This limited the initial sampling pool to 9 GACs who were refunded in 1975-1976, along with the SEAs in those states.

After eliminating GACs and SEAs that were not yet involved in sex desegregation assistance in three or more districts, it was necessary to add 3 GACs and 4 SEAs to the sampling pool to arrive at the desired site-visit sample size of 8 GACs with 8 SEAs from the same state or service area. Whenever possible, a GAC/SEA cluster was replaced with a GAC and SEA from the same geographical region, to maintain the regional balance of the previous study. The final sample included GACs and SEAs in 2 southern states, 4 northern states, and 4 western and border states. Nine of the 16 project offices, or 56 percent, were visited in the previous year. The regional breakdown is compared with that of the previous year in Table 62, below.

Given the reductions in site visits made necessary by budget cuts, and the loss of possible sites because of funding shifts and some limitations on sex desegregation activities, the site visit sample is almost as representative as that of the previous year. The one area of shortfall, however, is the lack of any Institute representation in the site-visit sample.

Table 62

CROSS-YEAR COMPARISONS: REGION OF SITE-VISIT SAMPLE

Year	Total States	North		South		Western and Border	
		% of Sample	No.	% of Sample	No.	% of Sample	No.
1974-75	14	35	(5)	30	(4)	35	(5)
1975-76	10	40	(4)	20	(2)	40	(4)

CLIENT SCHOOL DISTRICT SAMPLE

This year the project was limited to 3 client school districts per GAC/SEA cluster, for a total of 24. As a result, it was necessary to select at least one district for each cluster which was a recipient of both GAC and SEA services, whenever this was possible. In addition, it was determined that the sample would try to maximize the range of activities indicated on the Preliminary Sampling Forms.

Table 63 illustrates some of these activities. These services ran the gamut from highly individualized to very general and prepackaged. Because one thrust of the project was to investigate the compatibility between race and sex desegregation assistance, it was decided that districts that were receiving both kinds of aid would be oversampled, as would districts that had received Title IV services in the past.

Given the usual time and travel constraints and our desire to spend as much time as possible in the districts, we adopted the criterion from the previous year of limiting site-visited districts to those within 100 miles of the project office. From those lists, one project from each GAC and SEA was selected which had received different services from the district that had been served by both the GAC and SEA. As a result, the final sample of client school districts per GAC/SEA cluster contained 3 different activities, where possible, and 87 percent of these were receiving some school desegregation as well as sex desegregation assistance. Eighty percent had received SEA or GAC services in the past.

Table 63

TYPES OF SEX DESEGREGATION ACTIVITIES UNDERTAKEN BY SEAs AND GACs[a]

Type of Activity	SEAs Responding		GACs Responding	
	No.	%	No.	%
Workshops to disseminate information on Title IX	6	18	3	13
Sex discrimination awareness workshops	4	12	5	22
Workshops for administrators	5	15	7	30
Workshops for counselors	2	6	1	4
Workshops for teachers (including P. E.)	3	9	4	17
General workshops	3	9	3	13
Multi-district workshops	6	18	5	22
In-service, preservice training	8	24	7	30
Technical assistance	14	41	8	35
Curricula development, revision, evaluation	6	18	4	17
Information dissemination	3	9	1	4
Needs assessment	1	3	1	4
Proposal writing				
Total	34		23	

[a]These also are doing desegregation work in districts counted.

Appendix C

A BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF MAIL QUESTIONNAIRE CONTENTS

Mail questionnaires were sent to all Title IV GACs, SEAs, and Type D and Type S Training Institutes. Each project office received a questionnaire to be completed by the project director and up to four questionnaires to be completed by designated staff members. Each staff questionnaire was keyed to a specific district served by the project. This procedure provided the analysis team with comprehensive information about project operations from the project director along with detailed information about the interaction between the project and a specific district from the staff member. In the case of the GAC and SEA, districts were selected randomly from a sampling form sent to all projects (see Appendix A). Each GAC and SEA was asked to list up to eight districts that received sex desegregation assistance, and whether each of these districts also received race desegregation assistance. Two of these districts were then randomly selected for each project office. Type D Institute directors were contacted by telephone and asked to list those districts that were also receiving sex desegregation services. Two of these districts were then randomly selected for each project office by the procedure outlined in Appendix B. Type D TI directors who could not be reached by telephone and Type S Institute directors were asked to select two districts following a procedure specified on the project director's questionnaire (see Appendix A). For GACs, SEAs, and Type D Institutes, the staff person primarily responsible for delivering sex desegregation assistance was directed to complete the sections of the questionnaire that were pertinent to this type of assistance. In cases where race desegregation assistance was also delivered, the staff member responsible for delivering that type of assistance to the district was requested to complete a questionnaire dealing with those efforts. In some cases, one person was responsible for both types of assistance and completed the entire questionnaire; in other cases, two staff members completed different sections of two questionnaires.

This appendix presents a synopsis of items included in the director and staff questionnaires mailed to Title IV project offices.

PROJECT DIRECTOR QUESTIONNAIRE

Director Characteristics:

Demographics:

age, educational level, race, sex, and number of years served as project director.

Experience:

most recent job before becoming director, school system experience, and desegregation status of school or district when position held.

Present job situation:

other professional duties.

Staff Characteristics:

Demographics:

age, race, sex, position on project, and whether or not newly hired.

Project Office Characteristics:

Demographics:

size of staff, number of districts served.

Operations:

problems in staffing, methods of communication, organization of staff, problems in planning program, involvement of staff in project operations.

Program:

Sex Desegregation Assistance:

frequency of specific activities, target groups for activities, extent of participation of various personnel in planning activities, extent of support by various personnel for implemented activities.

Race Desegregation Assistance:

frequency of specific activities, target groups for activities, extent of participation of various personnel in planning activities, extent of support by various personnel for implemented activities.

Total Program:

method of implementing sex desegregation and race desegregation assistance, proportion of project resources devoted to both types of desegregation assistance, differential planning and support for each type.

Interaction with other agencies:

Host Institution:

position of supervisor, participation of host institution in project, relationship of project to host institution, position of host institution with respect to race and sex desegregation.

Other Agencies:

extent of interaction with other Title IV and non-Title IV agencies, method by which districts brought to attention of project, participation of regional office in project, and perceived usefulness.

In addition, several items were unique to the Training Institute director questionnaires.

Unique Institute Items:

reason for deciding to become Type D or Type S institute, extent of participation of various personnel in that decision, method of selecting districts, how

decision was made concerning which activities were to be delivered, extent to which services delivered to each district are different or similar.

PROJECT STAFF QUESTIONNAIRE

Staff Characteristics:

Demographics:

age, sex, race, educational level, number of years on project

Experience:

most recent job before joining Title IV staff.

Present job situation:

whether also director of project, other professional duties, time spent on Title IV, percent of time spent on race and sex desegregation.

District Characteristics:

Demographics:

student body enrollment, minority student enrollment, ESAA funding, description of district.

Relationship to project:

typicality of services received, number of years received assistance, methods to be used to learn about district.

Status:

stage of district with respect to race and sex desegregation, support of district personnel for each.

Program:

Sex Desegregation Assistance:

position of district contact person, frequency of specific activities, target group for activities, extent of participation of various personnel in planning activities, extent of support by various personnel for implemented activities, problems encountered while implementing sex desegregation program, perceived areas of effectiveness.

Race Desegregation Assistance:

position of district contact person, frequency of specific activities, target group for activities, extent of participation of various personnel in planning activities, extent of support by various personnel for implemented activities, problems encountered while implementing desegregation program, perceived areas of effectiveness.

Total Program:

proportion of resources devoted to race and sex desegregation, differential planning and support for each.

Several items were again unique to the Training Institute staff questionnaire.

- *Unique Institute Items:* Strategies and methods used in training sessions, timing and duration of sessions, purpose of training.

Appendix D

ACTIVITY CATEGORY DESIGNATIONS

I. SEX-DESEGREGATION ASSISTANCE ACTIVITIES

Activities are assigned to categories based on whether they were necessary for Title IX compliance.

A. *Stage 1*—necessary for Title IX compliance.

1. Helping districts develop procedures to insure students equal access to courses regardless of their sex.
2. Establishing a procedure by which districts can assess their sex desegregation related needs.
3. Helping districts identify policies or procedures that perpetuate institutional sexism.
4. Helping districts establish procedures to eliminate sex discrimination in staff hiring or assignment.
5. Helping districts develop procedures to insure students an equal opportunity to participate in athletics regardless of their sex.
6. Helping districts develop procedures to insure students an equal opportunity to participate in extracurricular activities, other than athletics, regardless of their sex.

B. *Stage 2*—not necessary for Title IX compliance, but necessary for continued work against sex discrimination in schools.

1. Helping districts establish procedures for identifying textbooks containing sex stereotypes.
2. Developing curricula that can be used to supplement district's information on women in society.
3. Helping districts locate personnel with coeducational experience in areas that have traditionally been segregated by sex, such as physical education.
4. Providing counselors with new counseling techniques.

II. SCHOOL DESEGREGATION ACTIVITIES

Activities are assigned to categories based on conceptual similarity; categorical appellation is descriptive.

A. *Training*—in-service activities that prepare school district personnel for desegregated school experiences.

1. Training school personnel in the use of new methods or materials designed for use in desegregated or desegregating schools.
2. Training supervisory personnel responsible for conducting in-service training related to desegregation in their schools.

3. Training local directors of desegregation projects.

4. Holding workshops to sensitize school administrators to desegregation related issues.

5. Holding workshops to sensitize school staffs to desegregation related issues.

B. *Programs*—activities that introduce new instructional or administrative procedures to school personnel.

1. Developing new instructional techniques for use in desegregated or desegregating schools.

2. Developing curricula for use in a desegregated classroom.

3. Developing new administrative procedures for use in desegregated or desegregating schools.

4. Developing new counseling techniques and training counselors to work in desegregated or desegregating schools.

C. *Desegregation*—activities that help districts to physically desegregate their schools.

1. Assisting districts in developing desegregation plans.

2. Helping school districts to realistically assess their capabilities for new desegregation.

3. Helping districts understand their responsibilities under federal and state guidelines.

4. Helping districts write ESAA or other proposals for federal or state funds to assist them with their desegregation related needs.

D. *Technical Assistance*—activities that help school districts to handle administrative problems caused by school desegregation.

1. Helping districts locate qualified minority personnel.

2. Helping school districts to establish desegregation evaluation techniques.

3. Visiting districts and helping them to cope with crises related to school desegregation.